The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXII, No. 5 May, 1945

CONTENTS

What About the Hundred Million? . *James G. Keller, M.M.* 321

By Any Other Name . . *Edmond Darvil Benard* 350

The Celtic Contribution to Scholastic Philosophy. Part I: The Pre-Scholastic Period . *William J. McDonald* 353

Why Does Rome Discourage Socio-Religious Intercredalism? *Paul Hanly Furfey* 364

A New Weapon for Catholic Apologetic *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 375

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Administration of Baptism to Unknown Dying Persons . . 389

The Language for the Interrogations at Weddings . . 392

The Last Gospel in Oriental Rites 393

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents Continued from Previous Page

ANALECTA 394

BOOK REVIEWS

A Preface to Newman's Theology, *by Edmond Darvil Benard* 396

No Shadow of Turning, *by Katherine Burton* . . . 398

BOOK NOTES 400

Timely and Practical

SUGGESTIONS

NUMBER ONE:

From time to time, your parishioners may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice.

Why not keep this in mind?

NUMBER TWO:

Do you bind your copies of *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* If you intend to do so, we can supply you with such copies as may be missing from your set, at the following rates:

1-10 years back	45c ea.
11-20 years back	50c ea.
21-30 years back	60c ea.
31-40 years back	70c ea.
41 years and up	80c ea.

Address: Business Manager

The American Ecclesiastical Review

c o Catholic University of America

620 Michigan Avenue, N. E. Washington 17, D. C.

WHAT ABOUT THE HUNDRED MILLION?

"A new order is in the making. It would be . . . a plain neglect of duty not to attempt to read the signs of the times and anticipate as intelligently as we can the situation that will confront us. The principal problems already appearing on the horizon are intellectual skepticism and moral indifference. They do not attack Christianity, they ignore it. How then shall we meet them? . . . By going after souls, with the selfless perseverance of the Good Shepherd."

Archbishop Cushing

Out of the 140,000,000 persons in the United States it is estimated that not more than 40,000,000 at most practice any formal religion. This leaves a vast mass of approximately 100,000,000 individuals in our country who are living off the benefits of Christianity, but who are becoming less and less conscious of the great Christian fundamentals that make possible their present way of life. It is quite obvious on all sides that millions are gradually losing sight of the great Christian ideals that have bolstered our civilization for centuries, for example, the concept of a personal God, the divinity of Christ, the Ten Commandments, the sacredness of the individual, and the sanctity of marriage and the home. If this trend goes far enough, many believe that it will open the way for the speedy rise of a new paganism that would eventually remove the United States from the society of Christian nations.

But, thank God, there is a very hopeful side to this picture. This trend has not developed to the degree that it is incapable of remedy. The majority of these 100,000,000 Americans are fortunately still blessed with an abundance of common sense. They are certainly neither anti-religious nor atheistic. They are endowed with an unusual sense of fairness and are often generous to a fault. They may be prejudiced at times, but this is seldom due to malice. It is because they do not know. They are truly interested in fair play for all men of all nations. These and many other similar traits are found only in peoples with a Christian tradition.

Furthermore, most of this great multitude who now show little interest in religion see, as they never saw before, that the savage forces that have risen up over the world in the last few years to crush them and rob them of their liberties have worked even more

furiously to stamp out Christianity, because these forces see in it the one great universal cause that champions the dignity of the human being. And they are beginning to realize that the avowed aim of these forces has been to remove the idea of God from the hearts and minds of men, in order that the one and only reason for the sacredness of the individual would be automatically and successfully stifled.

AN OBLIGATION AND A PRIVILEGE

The great majority who practice no religion can be helped. They should be helped. They are our brothers and sisters in Christ. As trustees of the fullness of Christianity, we have an obligation to them as we have a responsibility to those of our own flock.

The task of bringing Christ to all men is incumbent upon all Catholics who, by the very nature of their beliefs, are held to share them with others, even at the cost of great personal sacrifice. In his *Sermons on Subjects of the Day,* Cardinal Newman declared:

> This is the glory of the Church, to speak, to do, and to suffer, with that grace which Christ brought and diffused abroad. And it has run down even to the skirts of her clothing. Not the few and the conspicuous alone, but all her children, high and low, who walk worthy of her and her Divine Lord, will be shadows of Him. All of us are bound, according to our opportunities,—first to learn the truth; and moreover, we must not only know, but we must impart our knowledge. Nor only so, but next we must bear witness to the truth. We must not be afraid of the frowns or anger of the world, or mind its ridicule. If so be, we must be willing to suffer for the truth.

It should be a great privilege for us to have a part in leavening this great mass of unbelievers in our land. If we don't, others certainly will—others whose direction is not toward the tried and true things of Christian civilization, but definitely against them. While we stand by and do little about the slow but sure trend away from the fundamentals of religion on the part of the 100,000,000, others are at work night and day to win them away from Christ as speedily as they can.

Accompanying this unfortunate trend, whether as cause or result is not important, is the subtle undermining of our social fabric by atheism. All of us know the increase in skepticism among so-called intellectuals. Where there was formerly one college instructor not firmly grounded in Christian doctrine who declared it hard to square

scientific inquiry with faith in a personal God, there are possibly thirty today. Their skepticism, naturally reflected in their students, is now beginning to catch up with us. An increasing number of young people are being adversely affected. To date, insofar as religion is concerned, the net result seems to have been, for the masses, an impetus in the direction of agnosticism, if not downright atheism.

Add to the force of honest doubt the influence of the malignant, controlled propaganda against belief in God which is being spread by experts in deception, highly organized, and cleverly efficient, and we can hardly wonder at the subtle undermining of all religious foundation.

The Catholic Church in the United States is doing a very creditable job in protecting and fostering its own members. It is showing a healthy gain in numbers; the faith is cherished. But unless the Church takes a very active role in leavening the mass outside its fold, and in keeping alive a consciousness of the deep fundamentals of Christianity, is there not a likelihood that such an anti-Christian sentiment will be built up because of materialism and an active promotion of practical atheism that persecution of all religion is bound to follow?

Many feel that in our country we are gradually drifting into the same danger as that which beset the Church in Germany. A Catholic layman writing about the great setback the Church suffered in that country gave an interesting explanation. He pointed out that during the early days of the Nazi movement the Church was getting stronger and stronger—but only within her own sphere. Priests were interested and active in their work for souls. The laity also showed a deep concern for religion. They went to the sacraments more frequently. Churches were crowded. But little was done to protect the mass of the people outside the Catholic Church from the false philosophy of Nazism.

The more the cancer developed, the more the Church withdrew into an isolated position. Eventually the mass, without any leadership or guidance in basic fundamentals, became infected with the poison of the new idea. Religion survived, as it always has and will, but not without a terrific setback.

Moreover, in this connection it is interesting to recall that prophetic utterance about nine years ago in Indianapolis, by Abbé Le Maitre, the great Belgian priest, who collaborated with Einstein

in several experiments. He told a small group at a dinner that much of the success of the Nazi movement had been due to the fact that Nazi leaders had reduced their philosophy to a few simple ideas which they repeated over and over again until the masses of the people were so familiar with them and so well disposed towards them that the rest of their program was made comparatively easy.

The Abbé then said that unless the Church in Germany went to the same trouble to emphasize and popularize the great fundamentals of Christianity and to use every means at its disposal to instill them into the great mass of people outside the Church as well as within, it would probably face the greatest persecution of all history.

How right he was is evident from the tragedy that has been in progress in that country ever since. While the Church must come out triumphant in the end, yet it has taken a severe beating—one that perhaps might have been at least partially avoided if it had made a deliberate effort to leaven the mass of the people with the great Christian fundamentals.

In the same way, if the Catholic Church does nothing in the United States to leaven the great mass of persons who practice no religion, the forces of darkness are bound to do their own leavening. It takes only a very small organized minority to influence a mass for better or for worse. St. Paul said "a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump" (I Cor. 5:6), and he also showed by his own extraordinary zeal what a little leaven of the right kind can do. At present the only force effectively working in this country is one that is violently opposed to all we represent.

In a talk at Columbia University, Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, warned that "there is some danger that our country may go totalitarian." He pleaded that we rise out of our slumber. "Ours is the leading part in the most thrilling drama in world history," he said. "If we play our part courageously, fearlessly, and intelligently, we shall make an immortal contribution to the happiness and peace of mankind."

We shall accomplish little merely by pointing out the forces which are weakening the Christian tradition in America, or by bewailing the sad results of totalitarianism at home and abroad.

A writer in the *Catholic Mind* declared that a new Christendom or a new pagandom is ahead. Instead of lethargy, we need action, organization, and individual responsibility.

Complacency can descend upon practically all of us and easily cause us to slip into a very dangerous position. We may content ourselves by being very busy condemning Communism, without alluding to the fact that we have done practically nothing toward shaping a positive program for the vast multitude outside our immediate flock, in whom only the forces of darkness are interested.

His Excellency Archbishop Jules Saliege of Toulouse, who knows well the bitter experience of France with the Reds, expressed a similar feeling of insufficient effort on the part of Catholics when he said: "For us, Communism has a particular significance. It is evidence of our unfulfilled duty."

Fortunately, in this country, it is not yet too late for us to take the leadership. "Now is the acceptable time . . . now is the day of salvation" (II Cor. 6:2).

To meet the great danger that threatens even this country, something should be done *without delay* for our own 100,000,000. If we hesitate, we may be too late, as many other countries have been in recent times. We can no longer wait for the 100,000,000 to "come" to us. No, we must "go" to them, *before* others go first.

People are looking for the way to peace, as well as the way to God. His Excellency Bishop Michael J. Ready emphasized the urgency of our interest in "world society" at his installation at Columbus a short time ago: "The Church must now preach and interpret for world society by all the modern methods of education and publicity the age-old revolutionary doctrine that justice and charity are fundamental to peace."

We, as followers of Christ, have in our hands the peace not only of our own land but of the world. If we haven't, then no one has. But messengers are needed. It is a person-to-person job, and results will be more or less in direct proportion to the number of "laborers" who go into the fields "white for harvest." Christ Himself put it on that basis—a mathematical basis as well as a divine one. We must "go" and keep "going." The very significance of the word "euntes" means something continued and continual—without let-up. To reach "all peoples" we must keep "going" again and again until we have eventually penetrated all obstacles that separate the people from Christ.

We have not only to shepherd our own but to leaven the great mass outside our own. We must use every legitimate means to reach the 100,000,000.

The time could not be more propitious. As Shakespeare said:

There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

THE POSITIVE APPROACH

The vast multitude in the United States who practice no religion live in a "no man's land." It is nobody's particular business at present to reach them. The leavening of this mass of 100,000,000 souls awaits the attention of those who are entrusted with the fullness of Christianity. Until it becomes our special responsibility to make a continued effort to bring Christ to them, they will probably get little or no attention. Possibly the very continuance of American democratic ideals depends upon what the Church does for this multitude.

The situation is acute, the time is ripe for us to assume a positive strategy. In the Confederate general's famous words, the battle goes to the leader who "gets there fustest with the mostest." What will happen to us if we do not switch from the defense to a more active offense?

If we become really serious about this problem—if we become determined to do more than merely theorize or pass resolutions—we'll have to make some radical adjustments.

For this work of the leavening of the mass to be effective on a long-term basis, it must become part and parcel of the normal, routine life of the diocese and of the parish, since they are the fundamental channels established by the Church to communicate God's grace to all men, be they Christian or pagan.

No one can question the grand job now being done by the 38,000 priests of the United States. But they themselves would be the first to say that a specialized training is needed for this type of work.

Various forms of Catholic Action have made vital contributions to such a positive philosophy, as have also many periodicals, publications, and movements. But all put together seem to be inadequate to meet the tremendous task ahead. No one new movement can do it either. Many may be needed. The Communists in the U. S. A. multiply their organizations constantly to meet new developments. Today they have thousands of organizations operating

in this country. Nevertheless such a new movement as the one contemplated here, if launched on the scope that seems feasible, should be able to start a trend that can quickly snowball into something of major proportions. This movement, as visualized, would not conflict or overlap with any already established work now serving the general interests of the Church at home.

SPECIALLY TRAINED DIOCESAN PRIESTS FOR LEAVENING THE MASS

Quite recently France, a traditionally Catholic country, has shown a very realistic appreciation of the dangers ahead and is already leavening in a way that few would have dreamed possible a few years ago. The hidden strength and vitality of the great Church of France is beginning to assert itself. An article in the *London Tablet* tells of three new societies of secular priests formed in France within the past year to revive religion. In that country, which has suffered so much before and during the war, it is now realized that those who are against Christ have had the field pretty much to themselves, while those who are for Christ have been showing too little interest in the main stream of French life and have been largely confining themselves to "saving the saved."

If only one such society had been formed in France it would have been remarkable. But three starting spontaneously at about the same time is definite evidence that there is a growing consciousness of the serious need. In each instance, the training of priests for these societies will be modeled on that of students for the foreign missions. The men will be given foreign mission training for home mission work. Their objective will be to reach in every possible way the great section of French people who are beyond the scope of routine parish activities.

In our country, however, there may not be need of a new society of priests, but there is certainly need of a movement that will serve the 38,000 priests of the country by formulating methods and techniques that they can use in making a more effective approach to the great bulk of Americans in their own dioceses and parishes who are not touched by basic Christian teaching and who are being more and more colored and contaminated by the non-Christian or anti-Christian elements that are working hard to win them away from everything connected with Christ.

In talking with Bishops and priests in practically all parts of the United States, over a period of many years, we have found without exception that they are the first to emphasize that the big mission problem of this country will not be solved until thousands of priests are specially trained for the pioneering of all phases of mission work at home in much the same way as others are prepared for missionary life in foreign fields.

A Bishop from the South learned recently that two or three dioceses in the North were willing to send priests to his mission areas as soon as their chaplain quotas were filled and replaced. The Bishop was very much pleased to hear this. But he quickly added that it was far from a solution of his mission problems. Experience had taught him that priests fitted for parochial life were, with few exceptions, unsuited for the difficult grind of missionary work. He said that his own priests who did very well in large centers where the faith was active were not always successful when he assigned them to difficult areas where the faith either had not been planted or had been only partially developed. He claimed that two or three years was about the limit for efficient work in such areas by priests who had been prepared only for the usual parish work of the Church.

The only real solution, he felt, was to find priests who had been specially trained for missionary work. He had two very successful missionary priests. But they were only scratching the surface. "What we need," he said, "is a Maryknoll-for-America to popularize mission work at home and to train priests in large numbers for it."

But rather than establish a new society of priests, would it not be possible to develop the movement envisioned here to such an extent that it could give in some central headquarters a specialized training in mission methods (a three to six months' course) to a limited group of diocesan priests sent to it by the Ordinaries for that express purpose?

Bishop Walsh, co-founder of Maryknoll, was deeply interested in seeing such a movement started and tried in many ways to encourage various priests to foster it. He was concerned over the development of the Church in all sections of the country because he knew that interest in extending overseas missions would never hit a big stride until the work at home was well developed.

One of the great ambitions of Fr. Price, the other co-founder of Maryknoll, was to do everything in his power to share the blessings of his faith with as many people in America as possible. Most of his life was devoted to this task. When he later turned his full attention to the bringing of Christ to pagan lands, he hoped and prayed that many young Americans would rise up to carry on in the homeland where he left off.

MOVEMENT CAN BE STARTED NOW

Until it is possible to give priests such training, however, something can and should be done immediately to meet not only the present need but that which is bound to come in the post-war period. The actual movement could be started without delay with only a group of priests working under some Archbishop or Bishop who would guide them and keep them in safe waters. This group could work out formulas of approach and techniques that could be used to advantage at once in leavening the mass. When these principles are reduced to a practical form it would be easy for priests and a select group of the laity to begin putting them into effect immediately.

A possible name for such a movement might be "The Christophers," since all those connected with the movement would be in a very literal sense "bearers of Christ." Its one great objective would be to bring Christ to all in our land—whether they be in the crowded cities or in the most remote and sparsely settled areas—who either do not know Christ or are opposed to Him. But at the same time it is highly important that all who would endeavor to be such bearers of Christ should first of all make sure that they themselves are filled with the spirit of Christ—that in a very literal sense they are "other Christs." These two great purposes of the movement are well summed up in the words of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Cicognani: "This is our supreme mission—to live the truth of Jesus Christ and to show it forth to others!"

If such a movement is established, it would seem wise that it should be dedicated to all phases of the task of bringing Christ to *all* peoples in the United States, and be prepared for anything and everything that would involve leavening the great mass of more than 100,000,000 Americans not now being contacted by the Church.

SPECIAL COURSES FOR SEMINARIANS

It might also be the function of such a movement to give special mission training courses in the summer to selected seminarians who would be sent to it by their Ordinaries, and who would return after the courses were completed to their respective dioceses or seminaries. One priest from North Carolina said recently that the reason why many like himself, working in mission areas, are not more successful in their ministry is that they have not been given the background needed for such pioneering but have been prepared instead for the parochial work of a fully developed diocese. In like manner, priests of strong, large metropolitan dioceses who regard it as imperative to penetrate the mass of the population outside the fold before their communities become more pagan, readily admit that they must have more help and guidance before they can effectively tackle such a problem. Their own training, they point out, has fitted them very well for routine work of the parish and for defense of the Church but not for the missionary work that should be done on all sides of them.

The great objective of the movement, therefore, should be to serve and strengthen the missionary work of the individual diocese, whether in rural areas or crowded cities. The success of the movement would be measured by its ability to instill in the normal life of the diocese and the diocesan priests the spirit and methods of missionary penetration.

OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE ALL-EMBRACING

The possibilities of a well-planned and well-executed movement with an all-embracing missionary objective are tremendous. If developed sufficiently on a sound basis, it could serve in many ways and draw its inspiration from the Catholic University, the NCWC, seminaries, colleges, etc. His Excellency, Archbishop John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati, has pointed this out in a recent statement:

> We are just beginning to realize the tremendous possibilities of the home mission apostolate. Vocations and adequate support of the foreign missions after the war will largely depend on its sane guidance, its complete development and its stable maintenance. We should have an over-all picture of the home missionary work in the parish, in the diocese and in the nation. Our obvious duty after the war will be to set the

example for the world in prayer, in organization and in sacrifices. We already have hundreds of praiseworthy missionary movements and activities. They should be united in a voluntary union which will not be a fund-raising agency and which will not restrict in any way or interfere with the autonomy of any group. This union could give information on every mission project, communicate enthusiasm and enlarge and ennoble the vision of all mission-minded people.

I am convinced that the Catholic University can make a notable contribution. It now trains for the Bishops, Diocesan Superintendents of Schools, Diocesan Directors of Charities, and Diocesan Social Workers, also Chancellors and officials of the Diocesan Curia. For many years I have hoped that the University would train Diocesan Directors of Convert-Classes or Bureaus of Information. These directors could, after some years of experience and contacts with their fellow priests and mission-minded laity draw up for Bishops complete blue-prints of the mission work of their respective dioceses. I think no School of Theology in the world could have a Department of theoretical and practical Apologetics with such unlimited possibilities as the School could have at the Catholic University. From experience I know that a thorough survey of needed missionary work and workers made in parishes and neglected sections of a diocese is disturbing to the conscience of both pastor and Bishop.

We Bishops are so weighted down with routine work and official duties; we are so concerned with the ever-increasing activities of our day, many of them fussy, that it is very difficult for us to put the proper proportionate value on our labors. Many have not the personnel to undertake the various projects that they would gladly authorize or develop if they had the trained priests. I know that there is missionary work to be done in every parish of the southwestern part of Ohio. This is true of the largest parishes in the most populous centers as well as in rural centers. I know that there are sections of this Diocese that have frontier missionary conditions which seem incredible after 124 years of activity in an exceptionally well-organized diocese in which my saintly and capable predecessors labored long and zealously. I know the missionary work to be done in parishes and in many sections of the Diocese will not and cannot be done until trained diocesan priests are charged with the responsibility of doing it. These priests, especially the Diocesan Director, must be free to devote themselves entirely to the mission work of a diocese. The Sacred Canons (1350 § 1) give us this direction: *"Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos in suis dioecesibus et paroeciis degentes commendatos sibi in Domino habeant."*

LAITY FURTHER STIMULATED FOR CONCERTED ACTION

The work of this new mission movement for our country would be very much concerned not only with priests, but also with developing ways and means for the laity to become, under their own Bishops and diocesan priests, enthusiastic apostles in leavening the mass. If thousands of priests are needed for the leavening of the mass in our country, tens of thousands of lay persons must be found to act as auxiliaries. Throughout the country there are probably available right now at least 50,000 such persons who have both the ability and the zeal needed for the task of bringing Christ to the 100,000,000 in our nation who practice no religion. All that is needed, besides the help of God, is to arouse their interest in the vast opportunities right at our front door, organize them in their own diocesan units, and direct them by qualified priests acting under their Ordinaries.

For the past twenty years we have been giving talks and meeting various groups in all sections of the country. Though speaking primarily for Maryknoll and the missions, we have always tried to stir up as much interest as we could in getting people to do apostolic work immediately around them, in helping to strengthen and spread the faith here in the homeland. We felt it was all part of one and the same work, winning the world for Christ.

Reactions are always surprisingly favorable. Invariably people with whom we have come in contact say: "Please tell us what we can do. We want to help," or "How can we go about it?" The more we have observed, the more convinced we have become of the vast potentialities still untapped among our own people. Some Catholics are seemingly listless and indifferent now. But that is because they don't know what to do. They need only their leaders in Christ to arouse their interest and to spur them on.

FORMULAS CAN BE DEVELOPED

It should be comparatively easy to work out safe, simple formulas that show them a practical way of helping in the spiritual and temporal welfare of others. When these formulas, based on a close study of what has been accomplished in the past by zealous groups, are sufficiently developed, they could be passed on to the laity through the diocesan priests.

All this would be nothing more than Catholic Action. Of course it would take years to build up a lay movement that was not just something on paper, but a living, active organism for Christ. Each lay person would have to be given a careful, thorough training. Nothing would be left to chance or to the dangerous consequences of over-enthusiasm. If this movement of priests and laity could be developed on a practical basis in this country, it could be used with effective results in other parts of the world also.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the realization of this ideal is the lack of missionary consciousness among our own people. At present to most of them the very word "missionary" means little more than tossing a coin to some visiting priest from a remote part of our country or of the world. Seldom, if ever, does it occur to the average Catholic that he himself can be a vital influence in bringing Christ to the sphere in which he lives, works, and plays. But he can be a tremendous power. Once he realizes this, he becomes an apostle, delighted that he has the privilege of bearing Christ to others. But of course before this ideal of lay apostleship can become a reality, much spade work must be done.

There are many channels through which lay people may work to preserve the Christian tradition that makes a country like America possible. Foremost for immediate consideration might be (1) education, (2) communications, (3) personal influence in the community, (4) labor and government.

THE FIRST CHANNEL: EDUCATION

Probably the most important task ahead is to develop among young Catholics through education a greater sense of the good that they individually can do if they are deeply convinced that they possess the truth which can bring peace and happiness to mankind.

The present wonderful work of Catholic schools and colleges should in no way be underestimated. It is generally admitted, however, that we are turning out few leaders. In talking on the subject with deans, teachers, and students in Catholic schools in many dioceses we have found that they readily admit that something is missing. They say that the general trend is to overlook emphasis on the far-reaching influence each student can exert for good in whatever surroundings he may happen to be, on being a bearer of Christ to those who know Him not, on devoting time and effort to the spread

of truth with even half the zeal shown by those who are working to scatter error.

The present educational program, they frankly say, is limited to instilling in the student the belief that his first, and practically his only business is to save his own soul. Not much is said about his obligation to "sanctify others as he would sanctify himself." The student finishes his course deeply imbued with his responsibility to "love God above all things," but little concerned with "loving his neighbor as himself," except in terms of giving money or material help to the poor. It seldom even occurs to him that he has within him that truth for which men are yearning or that many with whom he daily rubs elbows will never in their lifetime partake of that truth if it is not in some small measure communicated to them by himself.

The result is that, with few exceptions, the Catholic college or high school graduate is not a leader. He is a good citizen and the backbone of the Church, concerned with taking care of himself here and saving his soul for the hereafter. He misses tremendous opportunities for good that could also be the means of deep satisfaction and strength to himself, and all the while the forces of iniquity are busy spreading poison on every side.

A friend of ours recently graduated with honors from a leading Catholic college. She had a fine sense of devotion to religion. But to her the great gift of faith was a private proposition. Only in the vaguest way did she think of it as belonging to others as much as to herself. She received Holy Communion each day. But here again her outlook was more or less restricted to "myself and God." She never adverted to the fact that over 1,300,000,000 human beings over the earth would never be able to receive Holy Communion once in their lives simply because Christ had never been brought to them as He had been brought to her. She would marry, settle down, raise a good family no doubt; but she would be isolated from the main stream of life which needs so much the influence of followers of Christ like herself.

We were discussing one day with this girl the breakdown of religion outside the Catholic Church and the gradual infiltration of dangerous ideas into the daily philosophy and living of those not blessed with the guidance of solid doctrine like ourselves. As with most things that did not directly touch on her own self or little circle,

she showed little concern. We told her that her only cause was herself—there was little inspiration in that. As far as her influence on the world was concerned, she might as well be living in a sealed jar! She had the truth of God within her, but she was making no effort to share it with others. On the other hand, those who are filled with everything that is evil are working night and day to spread their dangerous ideas. They have not been trained to think simply of themselves. No, it is dinned into them day and night that they have a serious obligation; they have a cause, and that cause is to win the world. They are fired with zeal. There is nothing negative or listless about them.

The bright side of this picture is that the situation can be changed for the better much more easily than most people imagine. At one Catholic college we have given several informal talks on the subject of influence. There is full agreement on the part of both the staff and the students that further training can widen immeasurably the influence of each graduate for good. Furthermore, there is a spontaneous and enthusiastic interest among both the teachers and the student body in making any adjustment in their concepts so that they may play at least some part in the leavening of the mass. We are trying to work along with them to develop a practical formula. The small amount of time and effort put into this little experiment has produced surprisingly encouraging results.

The scientist Steinmetz is credited with saying that some day men will realize the tremendous good and happiness that religion has always had in store for them. "I think the greatest discovery will be along spiritual lines," he stated. "Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of man. Yet we have been merely playing with it and have never seriously studied it as we have the social forces. Some day people will learn that material things do not bring happiness, that they are of little use in making men and women creative and forceful. Then the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces which as yet have been hardly scratched. When this day comes, the world will advance more in one generation than it has in the past four."

What is there to prevent Catholics from revealing this "discovery" to the great majority of people who have yet to learn of Christ—a discovery involving the peace and happiness of the world? It

would be a pity if we had to leave it to scientists to "turn over their laboratories to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces." Why not establish our own laboratories for priests particularly trained for this field?

Some time ago, after a talk at one of the country's leading colleges for women, we were invited to dine with the seniors. About six students were at the same table with us. The one next to us took up the note that we had struck in our talk—that all of us can be missioners wherever we may be.

She pointed to the girl at the head of the table and said, "There's a missioner for you. That girl probably wields more influence than any other student in this college. She is head of the Communists."

While she said that not more than 25 out of the 1,000 students at the college were really Communistic, yet everything she mentioned about them showed what zealous missioners they were for their cause. Every move they made had for its objective the furtherance of their one dominating idea. They made it their business to obtain as many influential positions as possible in all student organizations. They did not expect to make full converts out of any of the students, but they were anxious to touch everyone in the college because they knew that all who became even slightly disposed towards their philosophy became in reality one, five, or possibly ten per cent Communistic. They knew, too, that all these students eventually go out into various parts of the country, some to distant parts of the world, where each one would probably be fairly influential in her community. If they succeeded in getting this great mass of students only slightly disposed towards an atheistic philosophy, the results would, nevertheless, be far-reaching.

From what we could gather, these young apostles of atheism were first subjected to a thorough training in their Communistic philosophy before they ever reached college and were given continued guidance, direction, and inspiration after their entrance. Secondly, it must have been instilled in them that they were among the few entrusted with an idea that could change the world.

Each one of this small group felt that she was a vital part of a great cause. This conviction gave her power. There was nothing halfhearted about her. Nothing daunted her.

Finally, judging from their apparent persistence and determination, we saw they had become deeply convinced that their idea

should be passed on to as many people as possible. As the conversation went on, we could not help but reflect on what a tremendous influence a small group like this was having on a large mass of students. Here was a mere two and one-half per cent of the student body successfully coloring the outlook of the ninety-seven and a half per cent.

On the other hand, each one of the other 975 students had no cause beyond herself. Most of them were a colorless lot. They were neither hot or cold. Among them were eighty-seven Catholic girls. We met several of them. It was easy to see that the faith of most of them was being greatly dimmed. Some of them no doubt would even lose their faith. The rest would certainly come out of college much weaker Catholics than they went in. They were passive in contrast to the Communists. Hardly a girl among them had any notion that she possessed the greatest idea in the world, an idea that belonged to every other girl in the college just as much as it belonged to herself. Because she did not appreciate this, she had little desire to spread her philosophy of life. She was not interested in humanity for better or for worse.

In all probability no one had taken the trouble before she went to college to show her the extraordinary opportunity for good ahead of her; very likely no one was guiding, directing, or inspiring her after her arrival at college. She did not appreciate that she could make her fellow students one, five, or ten per cent for Christ, even if it were not possible to convert them the full way. And because she was not influencing, she was being influenced. She was slowly but surely losing her faith because she was not spreading it.

But the Communist who did see all her opportunities became stronger in her conviction and enthusiasm. She came out of college a more effective Communist than she went in, and she left far-reaching results behind her.

Ever since that experience, we have often regretted that the children of light are not showing the same zeal as the children of darkness. But the more one reflects, the more he becomes convinced that it is possible to transform Catholics into apostles of our cause. And this could be done without very much effort. It simply means further development of our Catholic concept and application of it.

Many instances might be quoted to illustrate this, but we think now of one which is very much to the point. By force of circum-

stances, a Catholic friend of ours went to another prominent non-Catholic women's college. During her high school days a priest had impressed upon her that she had a great gift in her faith and that she would be doing a great service to humanity if she took every opportunity of sharing it with others. She entered college, therefore, with the definite objective of doing everything in her power to touch as many students as possible with the faith with which she was blessed. Single-handed, she did what twenty-five Communists did at the other college. She made it her business to get into every position where she could further her philosophy of life. It meant time and sacrifice, but nothing stopped her. The priest who had first planted the ideals in her soul kept in constant touch with her and guided her. In everything she did she was always tactful, considerate, and kind. Gradually she began to win many friends, not alone for herself, but even more for the great cause she so ably represented. By the time she became a senior, her fellow students so admired her that they made her president of the Student Council. It is difficult to calculate all the good for religion that one individual accomplished. And because she did so much to share her faith with others, she strengthened her own to an unusual degree.

Results from dealing with individuals show how easy it is to make active apostles even out of many who are listless Catholics. A girl at another non-Catholic college said she was losing her religion. It was apparent that she was allowing herself to be influenced and that she was doing nothing to share her philosophy with fellow students. When reminded of this and taught the simple technique of penetration, she quickly changed from a negative Catholic to a very positive one. She not only strengthened her own faith but did much to impart it to others.

THE SECOND CHANNEL: COMMUNICATIONS

Opportunities are endless for infusing Christian philosophy into the main stream of American thought through the medium of communications. At present we avail ourselves of only a few such opportunities and are not even conscious how many others exist. This is no reflection on any of us. It has not been sufficiently impressed on us that we have a serious responsibility to share the truth we possess with all mankind.

We take pride in our excellent Catholic publications. But at most our journals reach only a tiny fraction outside our own body. A fine example of the aggressiveness of atheistic forces in this field is the fact that the Communists have over one hundred publications in New York City alone, the majority directed outside their own body!

In all that has to do with writing and visual presentation, we should take great care to know the norms of form that are acceptable to the general run of people. So often we make the mistake of presenting a lofty message in a form that appeals only to seminarians and nuns and a small group of religious-minded people. But it is absolutely out of tune for the great majority—for the very ones who need our message most.

One of the editors of *Readers Digest* told us that they would welcome more Catholic articles but that stories with a religious theme are usually written in such a sugary fashion that they cannot be used. Editors do not ask us to compromise in our substance, but they rightly insist on a presentation that is acceptable to the majority of their readers.

Basic Catholic teachings could also be woven into editorials and articles dealing with family, education, government, property, wealth, surplus, labor, capital, etc. This would need careful study and well-developed technique.

There is a great demand for children's books. It would be easy for young Catholic writers to specialize in this field. They could gain a substantial income while at the same time conveying Christian ideas through their books.

The most popular books today are the comics. Sixty million of them are sold each month. Comics leave such a definite impression on young people that the Army and Navy are now using them in preference to the movies and radio in order to put over their message. In writing comics it would be so easy to give a Christian twist to thought and language. For anyone gifted in this type of work and anxious to do good on a large scale in forming the thoughts of others, this one field alone offers tremendous possibilities.

In the field of literature, high and low, we have advantages that no other group possesses. As one non-Catholic writer put it: "You Catholics have something to write about." Even though we could

not and should not label everything "Catholic," yet we should be able to impregnate many short stories, articles, books, and comics, with Christian themes.

The influence which His Excellency, Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, has exerted through his magazine articles, books, and other channels can probably never be fully estimated. By reaching out to millions he has won understanding and friendship among all classes for the Catholic viewpoint. People everywhere have been impressed by the thought of a Catholic Bishop and priest going out of his way to bring to them the important cause he represents. Anything of an apostolic nature, done by either clergy or laity, usually leaves a deep impression. Those who will never come to us will often accept us if we go to them.

The forces of error are carefully fostering an interest in the newspaper. In fact, they have a definite working plan that covers a span of twenty-five years. (Nearly fourteen years of the plan already have been completed. Eleven years remain to complete the job.) Their objective is the complete control of communications in the United States.

New York being the focal point of communications in this country, it follows that a force which moulds public opinion in this city often moulds public opinion throughout the nation. Since this country occupies a leading position among nations, they consider that such an achievement would be virtual control of world communications.

Numbers of Communists go to the newspaper to start their career, because they know that most of the moulders of thought in the spheres of radio, movies, books, magazines, and other means of communication have usually made their start in newspaper work.

It is hard to believe that Catholic young people would not strive just as hard to take key posts in communications if they were given preliminary training explaining the great influence for good they could have in this field, while at the same time they would be making a decent living.

The managing editor of one of the leading and most conservative American dailies is a zealous Catholic with a wonderful sense of leavening the mass. Some time ago when he was consulted on the practicability of a Catholic metropolitan daily, he gave a very sound reply. Advising against it, he said that such a step would first of

all involve an investment of approximately ten million dollars and that even then success would be far from assured.

He claimed that a much more effective method to assure honesty in the news and fairness to the Christian point of view would be to get on the staff of all daily papers as many Catholics as possible who show apostolic zeal in getting truth into the news. But he quickly added that it is difficult to find even a few Catholics who are interested. He himself has tried to discover them but without much success. The inquiring Catholic is often preoccupied with thoughts of a high salary and a five-day week and only slightly concerned with the fact that in the key position open to him he would be able to affect the thinking of hundreds of thousands of readers. On the other hand, the editor said, those who are violently opposed to the fundamental principles of Christianity are making every effort to secure positions on papers. Furthermore, scarcely any Catholics are entering the leading schools of journalism; the enemies of Christ, however, are flocking into these schools and now form the bulk of the attendance.

Within the past few months a position as head of the feature department of a large and influential national magazine was open. One of the officials was anxious to have a Catholic college graduate in that key position because he felt that the sound philosophy of such a person would be a valuable asset in the choice and editing of material. But only one Catholic applicant was found who was qualified, and she was only partially enthused. After all obstacles had been removed and final arrangements made for the Catholic girl to take the position, she telephoned to say that she wasn't really interested in the job. The position went to another girl who had been twice divorced, was an open advocate of birth control, and was quite pinkish if not altogether Communistic. She had been working hard to get the opening, for she saw in it a big opportunity to get her ideas into channels that would reach countless thousands. That angle probably never occurred to the Catholic girl.

A young man who has an important editorial post on a national weekly magazine saw that in his position he could be instrumental in seeing that distortions of Catholic truth were avoided and that newsworthy Catholic items were not shunted to one side. He wanted no favors, but he insisted on honesty and truth. When a long, important article was being prepared on the Holy Father, he

was very much on hand to see that it got fair treatment. When the article first came to his attention, he found that it was about sixty per cent defective, without any malicious intent whatever on the part of the staff. The interested Catholic immediately worked hard to get the needed corrections made. As a result, a fairly creditable document on the Holy Father was read by at least 2,000,000 people—all because one man saw what a difference a little interest on his part could make.

Another effective means of reaching the mass is through Catholic information bureaus, reading rooms, and lending libraries. Christian Scientists have used this method of penetration with remarkable success. Catholics are employing it only on a small scale, but even the few experiments warrant, by the results achieved, duplication on a nationwide basis.

His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter of Indianapolis, through one information center he has established, has found that many people who would not have the courage to venture into a rectory visit or telephone the center. His Excellency, Bishop Hugh L. Lamb, Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, rented an old store next to a motion-picture theater on a business street in his parish and turned it into a combination reading room and book store. It is interesting to hear him recount the many and varied happenings in the little shop. One or more well-trained lay people are always on hand to answer questions and to help with problems and difficulties brought in by many non-Catholics who could be contacted in no other way. Special cases, of course, are referred to one of the priests of the parish. In New York, the Paulist Fathers have a most attractive Catholic Information Center and Reading Room that could be duplicated thousands of times over the country.

A lay person, Helen Henderson, started a lending library of Catholic books in a small shop on W. 54th Street in New York. She began it as a result of a missionary desire, as she expressed it, "for the diffusion of the Catholic philosophy of life through books and magazines." The far-reaching effects of this little enterprise may be seen by the fact that she has sent free of charge 400 rental libraries, ranging in size from twenty-five to 5000 books, to priests and laymen up and down the country who have requested her aid.

If so much good can come from so little effort, think what would be possible if some group of home missioners made it their business

to help diocesan priests establish such centers in every diocese of the country where the Ordinary saw fit to allow them.

Both the movies and the stage offer enormous possibilities for the apostolate. Right now, both these professions complain of the dearth of suitable themes for scripts. This is largely because practically the only writers working on scripts are those of very superficial imagination.

One priest has made it his business in odd moments of time to keep in contact with a few leaders of thought and influence on screen and stage. One of his friends happens to be the head of a large motion-picture producing company. As the result of several chats over a period of two years, this non-Catholic movie man has stated that he intends to produce a great film with a dominant Christian theme each year.

A Jewish producer, on hearing for the first time in his life of the central theme of Christianity as exemplified in the Catholic Church, immediately began to take an interest in dramatizing a story that is essentially Catholic.

Because of the interest of a few zealous Catholics in visual presentations of religious ideas, a huge Christmas crib was erected outside the Union Station in Cincinnati. In New York, Christmas, 1943, the entire Fifth Avenue windows of Bonwit Teller's store were devoted to a life-sized representation of the Adoration of the Magi. Both these displays grew out of the apostolic interest of a small number of lay people. A beginning has been made also in bringing Christ back to Christmas cards. Much more remains to be done through this powerful medium. It would be easy to duplicate these instances by the thousand, if Catholic priests, and, through them, lay persons could be shown the opportunity that is theirs to make the general mass of people pause a moment to reflect on the significance of the birth of the Infant Saviour.

In the realm of music there are many opportunities. A Christian slant can be given to many musical pieces, even those of lighter vein. Think of the millions of times the name of God has been on the lips of multitudes of people because Irving Berlin put the words "God Bless America" into his song of that name. New and more attractive hymns could be written, far more Catholic and popular than some at present in use.

We have not made half enough use of the power of the spoken word. Thousands of secular and non-Catholic clubs over the country would welcome Catholic speakers to talk on our way of life. This work can be done without watering down or compromising our fundamentals one iota. Priests and laymen who have been engaged in this phase of the apostolate have reported surprising results. What these few are accomplishing so successfully can be duplicated by countless others if taught how to emphasize the right points, avoid certain dangers, and leave an opening for return visits. Here is one more field already set up for us. All we have to do is to go into it.

Besides addressing secular clubs, we can often find opportunities for giving talks on the fundamentals of our religion to small and large groups in colleges. This avenue of penetration has already been touched. Yet it holds in store limitless possibilities.

THE THIRD CHANNEL: PERSONAL INFLUENCE IN THE COMMUNITY

Comparatively few Catholics may be engaged in such highly specialized pursuits as writing, lecturing, stage, movies, or music. But every lay person can discover opportunities right in his own neighborhood by which he can exert a power for good, whether he lives in the largest center or the smallest crossroads. Suppose there were only ten persons of real influence in a community. A practical technique could be worked out so that some one person, priest or lay, would establish and maintain a friendly relationship with each of the ten, not for any social reasons, but for the sole purpose of keeping that person continually conscious of the great Christian fundamentals.

Imagine the far-reaching results if it were possible to have each one of the most influential individuals in each diocese constantly but tactfully contacted by some priest or qualified lay person. It can be done, if the lay apostolate becomes the business and responsibility of some special group of priests of the diocese.

An occasional Catholic doctor or lawyer who has caught an idea of the great possibilities for furthering Christian principles in the pursuit of his profession has rendered invaluable service in communicating Christian fundamentals to patients and clients in a tactful yet effective manner. The apostolate carried on by these few could

easily be extended to thousands in similar professional positions if they were individually taught the method of imparting to those outside the faith the simple elements of the faith they themselves possess.

Not long ago a newspaper report said that several members withdrew from some civic enterprise in Harlem because of the presence of a few Communists on the board. That was just what the Reds were hoping for. When the Catholics withdrew, they left the entire enterprise in the hands of the very ones who they thought should not even have a partial control. The first situation may have been difficult, but certainly the second one became far worse.

One layman worked for years to prepare the way for the Legion of Decency. Two officials of one of the largest news distributing agencies in the country have been important factors in keeping off the market many objectionable pieces of literature.

In the field of education there are tremendous possibilities. Here again results will be in exact proportion to the number of interested persons who as students, teachers, officials, and members of boards of education are making serious effort to leaven the surroundings in which they move. Hundreds of secular colleges and public high schools are teaching dangerous doctrines. Most of those responsible for this teaching probably do not know any better. It is more ignorance than malice. Protests and condemnations have little effect. The only way to cure or lessen the evil is to see that workers with a Christian philosophy of life manage somehow to get into key positions in all such schools and then patiently and honestly strive to bring in truth.. Only then will error depart.

Adolf Harnack once said: "Of the Catholic Church, the greatest religious creation known to history, students who leave our schools know absolutely nothing. They indulge in its regard in wholly trivial, vague, and nonsensical notions." But only by penetration of truth into error, light into darkness, can ignorance and malice be overcome.

Acting under the guidance and direction of a priest, a number of lay persons are now doing apostolic work as leaveners of secular education. The results they have achieved give a most encouraging idea of what would be possible if there were more of them working under a coordinating plan and leadership. One Catholic gentleman did much of the pioneering that resulted in released time for religious

instruction for children in public schools. As a member of the board of trustees of an important secular university, another Catholic has been able to vote against several dangerous ideas that might have become a part of the teaching except for his voice against them. Still another is an active member of the board of education in one of the largest American cities. He has repeatedly been instrumental in keeping in the forefront Christian ideas which might have been tumbled out except for his presence on the board. It is important, of course, that great care be used in making sure that the lay people used for this apostolic work have instilled in them a truly Catholic outlook so that they will not do more harm than good. Catholicism for each of them must be "a way of life, a philosophy of life, an ideology with a bearing on every human activity."

THE FOURTH CHANNEL: LABOR AND GOVERNMENT

Perhaps one of the most fruitful fields awaiting the attention of Christian influence is that of labor. Although our Catholic theories in this field are sound, unfortunately in the mind of the laboring man they are little more than theories. Something more is needed and the people know it. There's no way to fool them. They know that Christians who champion the cause of labor are few and far between.

On the other hand, the laboring class is being shamefully exploited by professional agitators, missioners of discord, themselves often of criminal association and background. Just the same, these leaders have captured the laboring man's imagination, because while we have talked they have acted—obtained better wages, better living conditions, and even if hypocritically, have pleaded the cause of the humble throughout the world.

In Buffalo, a few years ago, small but well-trained units of the United Auto Workers Union prevented the infiltration of several Communistic ideas at the general convention there. The leaders had caught the idea that they could render the cause of labor great service if they promoted Christian principles on every possible occasion. What this one union did in behalf of Christian thought could be duplicated by thousands of other unions under proper guidance and leadership.

What is true of labor is becoming true of government. The number of Christians really interested in influencing for good the main

stream of official life in our country is becoming smaller and smaller. Often when there has been opportunity for good influence, the Christians in office have shown themselves so self-seeking and venal that, far from helping the Christian cause, they have done untold harm. They have shown no cause except themselves. Great numbers of those who actively oppose Christianity, however, are flooding governmental positions. They have only one objective—to leaven the mass in their own way.

These danger signals are apparently going unnoticed by most of the Christian public. Sometimes it seems that our good people are so busy taking care of themselves that they leave the bad people to take care of the world.

NON-CATHOLIC SUPPORT

David Lawrence, a non-Catholic, recently paid high tribute to the Christmas message of the Holy Father, remarking that the Pope is "truly one of the great statesmen of our time." A priest commenting on this statement was quite pleased with the tribute. He added that he had tried a hundred times to set forth the same theme in such a way that no fair-minded person could misunderstand his meaning. Then he concluded: "But I confess failure." This particular priest does much good—he is far from a failure. It is only that millions are interested in what David Lawrence praises or condemns, while those who pay much attention to what the priest says are numbered in the thousands.

The penetration of Christian ideas into the great irreligious mass of our country would be accomplished more quickly if we made it a point to route at least some of our Catholic wisdom *via* men like Lawrence and other non-Catholics. A Catholic woman who is a friend of a leading columnist never thought of the possibilities of the influence that she possessed until a priest reminded her that if she passed along to the columnist only one Christian idea from time to time, she might be instrumental in communicating this idea to the 8,000,000 persons who read this man's column each day. She readily understood and has been most effective ever since.

Every now and then *Pravda* or some Red paper lets out a blast against the Holy Father, accusing him of being pro-Fascist. Usually the only reply to such a diatribe is a statement in the Catholic press. Secular papers give little space to Catholic replies because

they know that the general public naturally tends to discount a professional explanation. The result is that the more mud the Reds sling at Catholic ideas and ideals, the more prejudice against us is built up in the public mind. But if a disinterested non-Catholic takes up the cudgels in our behalf, the reaction is exactly the reverse. The Church is justified. The Red cause suffers. Only recently, articles in the New York *Telegram*, Washington *Evening Star*, and New York *Sun* gave eloquent tribute to the Catholic point of view and effectively condemned that of the Reds.

At a reception some time ago, a noted woman columnist told a group of newspaper people, all of whom were also non-Catholics, that one of the few hopes for world peace lies with the Catholic Church. On another occasion, the non-Catholic editor of a leading weekly magazine, when reminded what he and others in his field might do to bring right thinking to the American public, replied that men like himself couldn't begin to have the effect that the Catholic Church could have "if it ever woke up." Although such instances as these cannot be expected too frequently, yet they can be repeated on a much more extensive scale, in small dioceses as well as large, if a sufficient number of individuals are on the lookout for openings.

As ex-Ambassador Bullitt wrote not long ago: "The deepest moral issue of the modern world is the issue of man as a son of God with an immortal soul, an end in himself, against man as a chemical compound, the tool of an omnipotent state, an end in itself."

We cannot avoid this issue and we must not. Our own interests are at stake as well as those of all mankind. If we who have the truth do not make an extraordinary effort, those who are without leadership are bound to be caught in the deceits and errors of the enemies of Christ. Without faith in God, men sooner or later lose faith in themselves.

Even if Communism and all other sinister forces disappeared overnight, our responsibility would still be a terrific one. We would still have an obligation to help the 100,000,000. The challenge of the increasing paganism in the United States is a serious one for us, one that is bound to involve generations yet to be born. But it is a challenge that we can successfully meet. We have God Himself behind us.

But our success, under God, will be in direct proportion to the number who "go" as Christ commanded us to "go." If there are

only a few messengers, if only a few of the clergy and laity "go" to leaven the great mass of humanity in this country now outside Christian influence, then we may eventually face a worse swamping than we have ever known. A serious setback at home would mean an even more serious setback in our efforts to Christianize the world. The strong movement contemplated here would thus benefit not only our own 100,000,000 but would help to protect all that American Catholics are now doing and planning to bring Christ to all mankind.

If we "launch out" in great numbers, if we build and plan and venture with the daring, courage, and faith that Christ expects of His followers, we may be the means of salvation to untold millions.

JAMES G. KELLER, M.M.

121 East 39th Street,
New York, N. Y.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the May, 1895, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Abbé Hogan continues his series on clerical studies with an article on Canon Law. He asserts that ecclesiastical legislation needs revision, and that in particular two things are called for—first, the abrogation of all laws which have fallen into desuetude or have ceased to be useful; second, the codification of all those which would still remain in vigor. (The distinguished Sulpician scholar, who died in 1901, did not live to see the formal beginning of the codification of Canon Law, which has accomplished these objectives.) . . . Bishop Gabriels of Ogdensburg contributes a list of books on liturgy useful for a priest's library, and the Rev. H. T. Henry of Overbrook Seminary suggests books dealing with sacred music. (Msgr. Henry is still with us, actively pursuing his literary labors.) . . . Fr. Hewit, C.S.P., comments on the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* discussing particularly the difficulties alleged by historians and scientists against the inerrancy of the Bible. . . . Fr. Sabetti, S.J., defends at length the principle that when a person has even a slight doubt about the validity of his baptism, he should be baptized conditionally. He is writing against a correspondent who believed that since the Church considered a doubtfully baptized person baptized in reference to marriage, there was no need to baptize such a person even conditionally when he wished to lead a Catholic life.

F. J. C.

BY ANY OTHER NAME

Shakespeare (a well-known English playwright) was awfully naïve. He wrote a play once about Julius Caesar, and all he could think of to call it was *Julius Caesar.* Which is obviously a hopeless title because everyone knows immediately what the play is about and how it is going to turn out. If he had known anything about the publishing business he would have called it *Morning in March,* or something like that. (*The Ides of March* would have been too much of a giveaway.)

Maybe Thomas Carlyle started it; I wouldn't know. And, on a sultry spring afternoon in Washington, I don't intend to push back any farther what I publicly allude to as "my research."

Well, this Thomas Carlyle wrote a book called *Sartor Resartus,* presumably about "the philosophy of clothes." Right away—so the historians of literature tell us—the gay blades, beaus, and dandies of London bought the thing. But when they took it home and tried to find out something on their favorite subject—clothes—they discovered that the title was a delusion and a snare. There was very little philosophy in it, and practically no clothes. But they had paid for the book by that time, and they were stuck with it.

These things get around, you know. From that time on, there seems to have been a certain school of thought in the publishing business (and maybe in the writing business, too) which has adhered to a strict code in the matter of book titles. A good title must (1) sell the book, by fair means or foul; and (2) give the purchaser absolutely no idea of what the book is about.

Sometimes "selling" titles have a reason behind them. Publishers of a certain type of anti-Catholic book, for instance, make their titles as lurid as possible, because they understand so well the mentality (and the mental age) of their public. This isn't a perfect example of what we mean, though, because these books really do contain attacks on the Catholic Church, as their blatant titles indicate.

What we are thinking about principally is the practice of putting on books titles which not only "sell" the books but effectively conceal their contents. Have you written a book on astronomy? Good! We'll call it *And Not the Plough!* What do you mean, "obscure"? Didn't Sean O'Casey write a play called *The Plough and the Stars?*

Well, your book is only about stars, isn't it? So—*And Not the Plough!*

In less exaggerated form, this is a misdemeanor (if not a felony) of which even our Catholic publishers have been by no means guiltless in recent years. . . .

* * * * *

Author's note: That's all there is to the article. It happened this way. When I arrived at the above point, I realized that I was getting on delicate ground, and that I had better visit the offices of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* and see if such an article would be acceptable before I wasted any more time on it. I found the outer office occupied by a person who was obviously one of the sub-editors.

I said, "May I see the editor, Father . . ."

"Shush!" he shushed. "Don't you know that we never allow our subscribers to know the name of the editor or any of the associate editors of the AER?"

"Why?" I asked.

"They'd be comin' out to git us!" he said darkly.

"Like the bonus march on Washington?"

"Precisely."

"Well," I said, "why not allude to the editors as the Messrs. O'Malley?"

He consulted a big book.

"No," he sighed. "There are thirty-three Father O'Malleys in the *Catholic Directory* and they'd all be libel to sue for liable. I mean liable to sue for libel."

"I wasn't referring to any *Father* O'Malley," I explained. "I meant *Mister* O'Malley. You know, Barnaby's elusive fairy-godfather in the comic strip."

"I never read comic strips," he said coldly. "Do you?"

"Just 'Superman,' " I said meekly.

The conversation seemed to have wandered away from the point.

"About the article," I reminded him. "Do you think you can use it, or shall I write it for some less speculative magazine?"

He read it in three seconds flat. He looked at the basket marked "Copy for May, 1945." It was empty.

"We'll take it," he said.

"But it isn't finished yet; it's barely begun!"

"It's finished as far as we're concerned. We go to press tonight."

I started for the door.

"You'll receive a check promptly within two years after the date of publication," he called after me.

When I was just about in the corridor he summoned me back.

"Wait a minute. This title, 'An Argument in Favor of Appropriate Book Titles.' It's no good. Tells what's in the article. People would never read our articles if they knew what was in them. Change it to 'By Any Other Name.' "

"Why?"

He grew confidential.

"It's from a *play,*" he said. "This girl leans out of a window and says, 'What's in a name? A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.' It seems that the girl is in love with some fellow named Romulus, or something, and there's a fight going on between *his* family and *her* family. See?"

"Tell me more," I said.

Well, he told me the whole story and it sounded like a pretty good plot. So I left the article with him and told him to call it whatever he wanted to. I'm glad that the editors let me read the proofs so that I could add this note and give the readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* a glimpse into the busy, fascinating, behind-the-scenes world of the publication offices of a major magazine.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE PRIEST IN, BUT NOT OF, THE WORLD

He who is raised to the dignity of so great a ministry should not only be pure, but he should also be prudent and of wide experience, and no less versed in secular affairs than they who are engaged in them, yet more free from all attachment than monks who dwell in the mountains.

—St. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), p. 126.

THE CELTIC CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY.

PART I: THE PRE-SCHOLASTIC PERIOD

The influence of the Celt in the promotion of scholarship and Christian culture has long since been acknowledged as great by those who seem best qualified to judge concerning such rather intangible, and therefore today often misunderstood, values.[1] One chapter, however, of that proud record has been comparatively neglected, namely, the important role played by the children of Patrick in the development and transmission of the perennial wisdom.[2] This lacuna appears all the more unaccountable when we consider that his earlier spiritual descendants were accustomed to stress as marks of true lineage, not political or military achievements nor, in fact, ecclesiastical administration as such, but the good life and learning even of the secular variety, since this type also may be a preparation for the higher contemplation.

The following brief account, tracing for the most part only the deeper Celtic currents and confining itself mainly to the Scholastic stream, does not presume to supply the above regrettable deficit. It aims simply to present a broad general picture of the problem and to give the reader a running acquaintance with some more or less recent findings in view of which it would appear necessary to relocate one little-observed but none the less brilliant constellation and endeavor to gauge anew the extent of its illumination in the great universe of thought. In the nature, then, of a re-appraisal and summary, our exposition falls naturally into two sections; in the pres-

[1] The term Celt is used here mostly in a restricted sense. In the early literature it has, of course, much wider application. Cf. H. D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Introduction a l'étude de la litterature celtique* (Paris, 1883) as well as his various other works. Also Henri Hubert, *The Rise of the Celts* (New York, 1934). Professor Curtis, in his recent *History of Ireland* (London, 1936), says that the latter country is "today the only Celtic nation State left in the world" (p. 1).

[2] Such works as *The Glories of Ireland* edited by Dunn and Lennox and *The World's Debt to the Irish,* by James J. Walsh, however excellent and comprehensive otherwise, have no section on philosophy. The *ex professo* treatment of the subject, *A Short History of Celtic Philosophy*, by Herbert Moore Pim (Dundalk, 1920), devotes very little space to the entire scholastic contribution, discussing in this connection only Scotus Erigena and Duns Scotus.

ent article we shall deal with the early or pre-scholastic period and then, in a later issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* go on to examine the later phases as represented in the golden age of Christian thought. Any incidental reference to ancient or modern times is intended merely for the sake of illustration or contrast while no attempt is made to estimate the impression made by living philosophers of the Celtic tradition on the contemporary world since it is felt that any such evaluation at this time would run the risk of being at worst invidious and at best premature and tending to hopeful prophecy.

Grace builds on nature. Therefore it may be worth while at the outset to take a brief glance at the background in pagan antiquity. Most of the classical references to the Celts, such as those of Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny, have geographical and historical rather than philosophical significance. It is interesting to note that Plato was the first to call attention to their warlike and bibulous traits.[3] He does not, however—wise and just man that he was—presume to pronounce against them on this score, merely debating as to whether the Spartan abstention from wine is preferable to the conviviality of the Celts, Persians, Carthaginians and a number of other noble races. Nevertheless the pagan Celts do not appear to have been altogether conspicuous for virtue. Aristotle, while paying tribute to their courage and insensibility to pain, also refers to some of their peculiarities such as the custom of clothing their children in light garments and other definitely reprehensible proclivities.[4]

Diogenes Laertius gives us a distinct lead when he mentions, amongst others, the Celtic Druids as having originated the profession of philosophy.[5] Concerning druidical worship and practices much has been written but it is by no means easy to discern any clear and definite underlying principles. They appear to have envisioned a form of immortality somewhat akin to the Christian belief concerning the resurrection of the body. Some would say also that they accepted the doctrine of the "world soul" and claimed that men, notably themselves, were "makers of the cosmos."[6] Pim sees a close affinity between the Celtic and the Platonist mentality.

[3] *Laws,* I, 9.

[4] *Nichomachean Ethics,* III, 10; *Politics,* II, 9 and VII, 17.

[5] *Vitae, Intro.,* I. See also Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata,* I, xv, 71, 3.

[6] Pim, *op. cit.,* pp. 20 f.

Others, perhaps for similar reasons, point out that even in pre-Christian times the Celtic soul typified the *anima naturaliter Christiana* having, as it were, an exigency for the Gospel teaching. This is borne out in many a legend and beautifully summarized in the poem of T. D. Sullivan entitled "The Death of King Conor Mac-Nessa," an almost verbal rendering of the old bardic story which tragically portrays how the royal contemporary of Christ was so agitated with righteous indignation on hearing the news of the Crucifixion that, due to his already aggravated condition, it brought about his own death. Thus he is reputed to be the first spiritual martyr for the Christian cause. Naturally, here, as in budding philosophies generally, it is often difficult to disentangle facts from the maze of myth which enshrouds them, more especially if "the neo-Platonic notion that myths should be used to symbolize truths" was quite different from that of the Celt who "expressed his philosophical doctrine in a myth and was willing that it should thus remain buried out of sight of the crowd."[7] Hence it profits little to pursue this phase further. It was but an adumbration of the glory that was to come and so we pass quickly out of the shadows of paganism into the clear light of Christianity.

It is sometimes claimed that there was an outstanding Irish philosopher, belonging in the Christian tradition, who taught at Rome and at Athens even before St. Patrick had yet launched his great apostolic mission.[8] This claim does not appear to have been reliably substantiated, but that there were men of high learning in Ireland itself—some, perhaps, already well versed in Christian lore—at the time of Saint Patrick's arrival is evident from his *Confession,* in which he apologizes for his own relative nescience; and, incidentally, neither the *Confession*[9] nor the *Epistle against*

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Cf. George Sigerson, *The Easter Song of Sedulius* (Dublin, 1922), pp. 3 f.

[9] Cf. *Rerum Hibernicarum scriptores veteres* (London, 1814). *S. Patricii confessio sive epistola ad Hibernos,* which begins, "Ego Patricius peccator, rusticissimus et minimus omnium fidelium et contemptibilissimus apud plurimos . . ." (I, 109). Cf. also *S. Patricii ad Coroticum epistola* (p. 117). It should also be noted that there is a wealth of social and political philosophy embedded in the *Senchus Mor* or Grand Old Law. For the most recent discussion concerning the existence of an earlier or "old" Patrick see Thomas F. O'Rahilly, *The Two Patricks, a Lecture on the History of Christianity in Fifth Century Ireland* (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1942), and the replies in *Studies,* XXXII (Sept., 1943).

Coroticus, which is also ascribed to him, substantiates the impression that he himself was quite as "rustic" or "unlettered" as his great humility inspires him to protest. In any early period of intense missionary activity one does not expect a full flowering of "the wisdom of the philosophers" since at such a stage there is, rightly, more urgent necessity for "the wisdom of the Saints." Consequently in St. Patrick, as in so many of the great Christian Fathers, we do not discover anything more than an inchoate philosophy. The same is true of his immediate disciples, although many of them achieved distinction in related fields. Of St. Columcille (†597), Montalembert says that he was born a poet and he lived a poet all the days of his life[10] Baithan (†598) excelled in his knowledge of Sacred Scripture;[11] while St. Columbanus (†615), whose missionary travels brought him all the way to Bobbio, almost within sight of Rome, was skilled in grammar, poetry, and rhetoric.

Similarly the seventh century, admittedly a bleak period intellectually in most other countries, was for Ireland a "siècle de splendeur" producing such scholarly wanderers as Aidan (†651), who specialized in the study of the *Psalms,* and other exponents of heavenly wisdom such as Finan (†661) and Colman (†c. 664).[12] St. Adamnan (†704), Columcille's biographer and successor in Iona, was not only an authentic historian as many authorities and his own work attest, but also drank deep of scriptural and classical knowledge.[13] It is not, however, until the eighth century that we find the

[10] Count de Montalembert, *Monks of the West* (New York, 1905), I, 8. Montalembert also mentions a certain Longarad of Ossory who was "a holy recluse, very learned, doctor in laws and in philosophy . . ." (*Ibid.,* p. 14).

[11] *Acta sanctorum Hiberniae* (Edinburgh, 1888), p. 871.

[12] Bede, *Hist. eccles.,* 3, 27. In reference to this period De Wulf observes that the Benedictines, who were the great educators of the West, are to be found first of all in Ireland "in which country Greco-Latin culture flourished in quite a remarkable way from the seventh to the ninth centuries. Monasteries like those of Clonard, Bangor, and Armagh, restored the classical tradition which had been lost. At this time Ireland was the one bright spot in the dark night which covered Europe. In fact it has been called the Lamp of the North. Sedulius, Alcuin, and Scotus Erigena came from its schools and passed over to the Continent." (*History of Mediaeval Philosophy,* translated by E. C. Messenger, 3rd English ed., based on the 6th French ed. [London, 1935], I, 50.)

[13] St. Adamnan, *The Life of Saint Columba,* translated by W. Huyshe, 3rd imp. (Dublin, 1922).

first specific philosopher (in the wide sense in which the term was then used) of this tradition, namely, St. Virgilius, who established a monastery at Salzburg and died there as bishop in 784.[14] Virgilius anticipated the Copernican system by teaching the sphericity of the earth and also defended the existence of the Antipodes in the celebrated controversy with St. Boniface. A number of famous *Scotti* appear about this time, mainly in connection with the Carolingian revival. Besides Josephus Scotus who died about 796, and Thomas Scotus, Palatine professor, there was Clement the Irishman who succeeded Alcuin as Master of the Palace School. Clement acknowledged the Greeks as "our teachers in every branch of learning," wrote a grammar which reveals extraordinary erudition, and was held in high esteem by the savants of his time. Dungal (*Hibernicus exul,* as he refers to himself) and Dicuil were noted astronomers. A letter from the former to Charlemagne, which is extant, attempts to explain an eclipse of the sun that occurred about 811; while the latter was author of *Astronomia* and *De mensura orbis terrae.*[15] A little later there flourished Cruindmelus, Malsachanus, and Sedulius the Younger (also surnamed Scotus), who wrote a commentary on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry as well as a work on government entitled *De rectoribus Christianis,* the prototype of a subsequent series of medieval treatises concerning the duties of the prince.

Not only are the Irish teachers associated with the school of dialectics that flourished at Auxerre and with the logical studies of the monastery of St. Gall (we have from the school of logic in St. Gall not only the treatises published by Hattener and Piper, but also several hitherto unedited works, including a set of verses on the valid moods in the three syllogistic figures—a kind of forerunner of the "Barbara, Celarent" of Peter the Spaniard). They are also associated with abstruse meta-

---

[14] *Monumenta Germaniae historica,* SS. XI, 86-95. Cf. also J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland* (New York, 1929), I, 523 ff.; and George Metlake, "St. Virgil the Geometer, Bishop of Salzburg and Apostle of Carantonia," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* LXIII, 1 (July, 1920), 13-21. M. Esposito, "Dicuil: an Irish Monk in the Ninth Century," *Dublin Review,* CXLI (Oct., 1905), 327-37.

[15] Authority for much of the material here will be found in the standard source books by Kenney, Lannigan, Gougaud, Healy, D'Alton, etc. Cf. also Traube, *O Roma nobilis,* and Zimmer, *Keltische Kirche,* as well as the more recent work by J. Ryan on *Irish Monasticism* (Dublin, 1931).

physical and mystical theological speculations suggested by the works of the Neo-Platonists, of which the rest of Europe at that time understood very little. For example, the Irishman, *Macarius Scotus,* who lived in the ninth century in the abbey of Corby, commenting on a passage of St. Augustine's *De Quantitate Animae,* revived the doctrine of monopsychism; that is to say, he taught that there is but one mind, or intellect, in which all men participate. Unfortunately, his work is lost; we have, however, an answer to it from the pen of the celebrated Ratramnus.[16]

By way of extenuation of the error of St. Jerome, who incorrectly hurled his "Irish porridge" epithet at Pelagius, a Briton, it is said that the heretic had as one of his staunch supporters an Irishman named Celestius. This is difficult to understand in view of a report made later by St. Columbanus to Pope Boniface that no heresy or schism had ever tarnished the Irish Church. Unfortunately, however, the same stigma could be attached with some justification, as regards truth at least if not from the point of view of certain other virtues, to the writings of one who was otherwise renowned as the sole shining light of the dark ages. The "pultes Scottorum" was revived in the condemnation of the *De Praedestinatione* of John the Scot, or as he is now generally known, John Scotus Eriugena. The latter appellation is obviously superfluous since "Scotus" was the accepted equivalent of "Irishman" during the early middle ages while Eriugena means "born in Eire"; but the redundance has at least the merit of leaving no doubt concerning his place of origin. Some of the mistiness hitherto surrounding this strange figure, standing literally in splendid isolation, has been lifted by the authoritative study of Dom Cappuyns and a much clearer and fairer estimate of him can be formed when the promised complete critical edition of his works is available. With the few fragments it is possible to glean concerning his life and character we are here not directly concerned, nor indeed with his philosophical doctrine as such, but some consideration must be given to both in order to estimate the extent of his influence and his orthodoxy.

At the invitation of the Emperor Charles the Bald, with whom Malachy, the Irish High King, was apparently on very congenial

[16] William Turner: "Irish Teachers in the Carolingian Revival," *The Catholic University Bulletin,* XIII (Oct., 1907), 571.

terms, what Eric (or Heiric) of Auxerre describes as a "flock of philosophers" went from Ireland to France toward the middle of the ninth century.[17] Of these *Johannes Advena* or, as he also styles himself, *"extremus sophiae studentium"* was, to continue the latinisms, *facile princeps*. He was an original and independent genius, a polished writer of Latin and stood absolutely supreme in his knowledge of Greek. It was precisely his proficiency in the Greek language that later led him into difficulty, for it naturally turned his attention to the Eastern Fathers and equipped him to begin his series of translations which included such cloudy and abstruse writings as those of Maximus the Confessor and the pseudo-Dionysius. At the same time it must be acknowledged that it was as translator of the latter that he molded the language of later Scholastics, since "it was Eriugena's text of the Areopagite that was utilized by Albert the Great, St. Thomas, Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventure: and it is these translations that contributed, in a degree that has not yet been accurately determined but which may be preponderating, to the establishment of scholastic terminology."[18]

John the Scot was probably a layman, as is indicated in the coarse and uncharitable denunciations of Florus and Prudentius. Later he may have taken holy, perhaps major, orders. Certainly with advancing age he appears to display an increasing interest in theology. Whether he ever abandoned the formula to be found in his *Commentary on Martianus Capella,* "nemo intrat in coelum nisi per philosophiam" we do not know, but his complete system of thought, in so far as it is possible to reconstruct it, appears to emphasize philosophy as the all-embracing and paramount science. This has given at least a semblance of plausibility to the charge of rationalism which makes him a sort of earlier Abelard. One has only to be acquainted with the recent controversies concerning the possibility of a Christian philosophy and the relationship of moral philosophy to moral theology to appreciate the delicate nature of this problem; and it cannot be overemphasized that Eriugena lived at a time when there had not been as yet any clear-cut and system-

[17] For an amplification of this section and much of what follows see the masterly study of Dom Maïeul Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Érigène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1933). Also the scholarly article by Denis S. Nerney, "Iohannes Scottus Eriugena," *Studies,* XXIV (Sept., 1935), 414 ff.

[18] Nerney, *loc. cit.,* p. 423.

atic presentation of doctrine such as we have today. Venturing forth then, into more or less unexplored territory it is unfortunate, although perhaps not altogether unexpected, that this pioneering traveller should occasionally seem to deviate from the true course. His works have, it is true, been condemned; but after his experience in the predestination conflict in which he really suffered the customary fate of the arbiter on whom both sides turn, he veered away from controversy and it is interesting to note that his professedly metaphysical treatise, *De Divisione Naturae,* was not officially censured until the Synod of Paris in 1210 after it had been used, or rather misused, by Amalric of Bene in support of Pantheism and other errors. The consensus of experts now tends to exonerate him from formal heresy. De Wulf, having explained that Eriugena bases himself on the neo-Platonic and Augustinian assumption that since there is no distinction between philosophy and religion therefore there can be no contradiction between them—both coming from the same source, says that instead of attacking dogma he is anxious to remain faithful to it and decides that he may be considered a rationalist only in the medieval, not in the modern sense.[19] As another writer puts it,

> For him the Christian Faith was the foundation of truth, and all knowledge was conditional thereto. The starting point of all rational investigation was to him the divine truth as expressed in the Bible. From this he concluded that faith is the principle with which the knowledge of the Creator in a rational being begins. Reason's task is to discover by processes of thought the meaning of the divine utterances.[20]

This could be regarded as a foreshadowing of the "philosophandum in fide" of John of St. Thomas; and one may justifiably conclude that Eriugena is to be classified as a mystic rather than as a rationalist. Consequently with regard to his culpability *in foro interno* authorities generally are now inclined to answer that question by

[19] De Wulf writes: "Bearing in mind these principles which govern his theological interpretations, we may call Scotus the father of medieval rationalism. In contrast with modern religious rationalism, which in the name of reason rejects the Christian doctrine, the religious rationalism of the Middle Ages claimed to establish the data of this doctrine in the name of reason. Others followed in the way opened up by Scotus and ended in heresy." (*Op. cit.,* I, 124.)

[20] Pim, *op. cit.,* pp. 79 f. Pim, however, thinks the philosophical system of Eriugena is "a blend of theosophy and gnosticism." (*Ibid.*)

recalling the succinct verdict of Thomas Gale, who brought out the first printed edition of the *De Divisione Naturae* at Oxford in 1681, to the effect that he could indeed have been in error but it was not according to his intention: "Potuit ergo errare: haereticus esse noluit."

Nevertheless, even a slight acquaintance with the method and content of this great work, which has been described as "a monument of encyclopaedic erudition" and as "the only philosophical and theological synthesis of the early middle ages," reveals how readily it permits of an heterodox interpretation. Taking the form of a discourse between a teacher and his pupil, it envisions two types of knowledge, the one a lower, analytic, and the other a higher, synthetic, cognitive process. These would probably parallel somewhat the *ratio inferior et superior* of Augustine and Aquinas. Then there is his famous four-fold division of "nature" which Eriugena in some parts of the text appears to regard as synonymous with "reality" and even with "Divinity." First there is God as Prime Cause or nature uncreated and creating (*quae creat et non creatur*). In elaborating this, the terminology used is admittedly slippery and hazardous in the extreme. For instance, it is said that God is so perfect and transcendent that He is "incomprehensible not only to us but to Himself." The great flashing Celtic mind, leaping along in its sweeps and cycles, saw no inconsistency in averring that because God "does not know *what* He is, He knows Himself truly as God"; and because He is without "quiddity" He cannot be compared with anything and therefore may be called "nothing." Undoubtedly he was thinking of Augustine's "melius scitur nesciendo" and suffered from the halting and imperfect state of the doctrine of analogy, stressing too much the mode of negation at the expense of affirmation. It is to be noted, however, that even today somewhat similar phrases are used in describing our knowledge of God such as that we know *quia est, quid non est, sed non quid est.* Eriugena was, to use an Irishism, simply born before his time.

Another Celtic trait—a natural tendency to idealism—shines out in his second division, which is that of nature created and creating (*quae creatur et creat*). This is intelligible only against a Platonic background. It comprises the primordial causes or exemplar types of all things as contained in God. They are spoken of as "creations," though we are not to understand this in the strict sense, and

Eriugena illustrates them mathematically by making the "ideas" the radii of a circle in close proximity to the center (which is God). Out at the periphery are the objects which constitute the world of phenomena visible to the senses or the third division, which is nature created but not creating (*quae creatur et non creat.*) Concerning the individual reality of these "divine theophanies," real in themselves but shadows in relation to God, we have further evidence of the Platonist-Celtic strain which has been, and which, it is hoped, will continue to be a healthy antidote to materialism and positivism. Finally, in the fourth division is God as final cause or nature neither created nor creating (*quae nec creatur nec creat.*) Here, and even more clearly in the bipartite division which Eriugena seems to prefer, we have the outlines of what was later to form the framework of the great *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas and which appears elsewhere in the *De Divisione* as a twofold process, namely, the going forth (*egressio*) of all creatures from God as origin and their return (*regressio*) to Him as ultimate end. Thus Eriugena emerges on the verdict of most authorities no longer definitely tinged with charges of monism, rationalism, and agnosticism.[21] The relation between him and St. Thomas is not so utterly antithetical as some writers seem to imagine. They are, in fact, more correctly conceived as two opposite sides of the same shield or as two distinct moments in the development of scholastic philosophy. His system is not anti-scholastic but is rather a phase, or imperfect form, of Scholasticism. Even granting that he was a poor theologian he still remains a good philosopher—the greatest of his age—who contributed "a noteworthy systemization of reality." Preeminent in the pre-scholastic period he influenced the later schoolmen, if not directly by his thought, at least by "his translations, his dialectical technique and his felicitous Latin terminology."[22]

[21] Cf. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, I, 132: "Scotus is not a monist (Gilson and Cappuyns have established this definitely), for he holds that the substance of God and created substances are not identical. We can give an acceptable meaning to the texts which seem to be monistic, provided we carefully define the limits of the enveloping unity, and the lacunae in Scotus's description of these." Cf. Dom Cappuyns' theory of "exemplarist monism" (*op. cit.*, pp. 346 ff.); and De Wulf's penetrating criticism in his *History*, etc. (I, 133). Also Turner's articles "Erigena and Aquinas" in *The Catholic University Bulletin*, III (July, 1897), pp. 338-47, and "John the Scot," XVIII (Feb., 1912), 144-61.

[22] Nerney, *loc. cit.*, p. 423.

We may conclude that recent research tends to confirm rather than diminish the substantial accuracy of Turner's fine evaluation and summary of this whole period.

Notwithstanding hostile criticism, which, after all, was an unconscious tribute, the Irish teachers left a lasting impression on their own and subsequent generations. Not only were they the chief teachers of grammar, poetry, astronomy, music and geography at a time when these branches of culture had no other, or scarcely any other, representative on the continent of Europe, but they also profoundly influenced the course of medieval thought in matters of philosophy and theology. Their elucidations of the Gospel of St. John and their commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul formed a new school of exegesis, and it may be remarked, in passing, that their exposition was based, not on the commonly accepted Vulgate, but on an earlier Latin version and, sometimes, on the Greek text itself. They introduced the Neo-Platonic point of view in metaphysical speculation, and carried the art of dialectic to a higher point than it had ever before attained. *It is no exaggeration to say that they were the founders of scholasticism and that Ireland is the Ionia of medieval philosophy.*[23]

WILLIAM J. MCDONALD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[23] Turner, "Irish Teachers . . .", *loc. cit.*, p. 579. (Italics ours.)

THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY

Let them [husband and wife] constantly keep in mind, that they have been sanctified and strengthened for the duties and for the dignity of their state by a special sacrament, the efficacious power of which, although it does not impress a character, is undying. To this purpose we may ponder over the words full of real comfort of holy Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, who with other well-known theologians with devout conviction thus expresses himself: "The sacrament of matrimony can be regarded in two ways: first, in the making, and then in its permanent state. For it is a sacrament like to that of the Eucharist, which, not only when it is being conferred, but also whilst it remains, is a sacrament; for as long as the married parties are alive, so long is their union a sacrament of Christ and the Church."

—Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *On Christian Marriage* (N.C.W.C. edition, pp. 39-40.)

WHY DOES ROME DISCOURAGE SOCIO-RELIGIOUS INTERCREDALISM?

The present writer has recently discussed the papal texts on the co-operation of Catholics and non-Catholics for social reconstruction.[1] It was clear from these documents that, while the popes were quite generally favorable to such co-operation, they discouraged certain forms of it very definitely. The purpose of the present paper is to re-examine the texts to determine, if possible, the principles underlying the papal opposition to some types of social intercredalism. This discussion is made more timely by Fr. Murray's article of last March in which he gave certain papal pronouncements a different interpretation.[2]

The first step is to review briefly the relevant Roman documents from the time of Pope Leo XIII to the present. The great work of Pope Leo was to lay down general principles. He made it very clear that the reform of society is not a purely secular matter but is religious as well. This principle bears directly on questions of intercredal co-operation; for obviously co-operation with heretics on religious matters raises difficulties which do not appear when the collaboration deals with purely temporal concerns.

In 1888 Pope Leo laid down the basic doctrine that faith "is the principle, not only for correcting the lives of individuals, but also for judging those matters whose interplay hinders the calm and security of states."[3] In the *Rerum novarum* he repeated the same thought in words which Pope Pius XI was to quote forty years later: "If human society is to be healed, only a return to Christian life and institutions can heal it."[4] Later he referred to this encyclical as a treatment of the social question "upon principles taken from the Gospel and also from natural reason."[5] In the *Graves de communi re* the Pope condemned the opinion "that the so-called *social question* is merely an *economic* one," adding: "The exact contrary is

[1] Paul H. Furfey, "Intercredal Co-operation: Its Limitations," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXI, 3 (Sept., 1944), 161-75.

[2] John Courtney Murray S.J., "On the Problem of Co-operation: Some Clarifications," *AER,* CXII, 3 (March, 1945), 194-214.

[3] Pope Leo XIII, Letter, *Exeunte iam anno,* Dec. 25, 1888.

[4] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Rerum novarum,* May 15, 1891.

[5] Pope Leo XIII, Apostolic Letter, *Praeclara gratulationis,* June 20, 1894.

true. It is primarily moral and religious."[6] Finally, speaking of the evils which arise from the class struggle, he stated that "these are evils for which it is vain to seek a remedy in the watchfulness of the laws, the threat of penalties, or the counsels of human prudence," and went on to propose the Holy Eucharist as the basic solution."[7]

There is one other pronouncement of Pope Leo XIII which deserves mention apart. He was talking of workingmen's associations. One might expect that such organizations would be concerned exclusively, or at least primarily, with such mundane matters as wages, hours, and the conditions of labor. The Pope, however, conscious of the supremacy of the supernatural in Catholic social action, saw them in a different light. "It is clear," he said, "that religious and moral perfection should be considered their principal object and that this object should principally motivate their social organization."[8]

The work of Pope Pius X followed directly and logically from the work of his great predecessor. Pope Leo had laid down the principle that real social reform must be based on the supernatural; Pope Pius insisted that Catholic organizations live up to this principle. A certain false intercredalism was the specific issue. The precise nature of the evil was neatly defined in a letter which the Pope wrote through his Secretary of State to Bishop Bougoüin. It was "the sort of confessional neutrality which is sometimes allowed to creep into professedly Catholic activities where the object seems to be to take in the maximum possible number of participants with the minimum possible number of supernatural conditions."[9] Obviously this was a real danger. If the true supernatural character of Catholic social action were to be watered down by a false intercredalism, then its effectiveness would be undermined and the emphasis which Pope Leo had placed on the supernatural would be forgotten.

As early as 1904 the Pope was concerned about the attraction which a certain species of religious neutrality had for some Catholics. Count Medolago Albani was praised because his organiza-

[6] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Graves de communi re,* Jan. 18, 1901.

[7] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Mirae caritatis,* May 28, 1902.

[8] *Rerum novarum.*

[9] Cardinal Merry del Val, Letter to Bishop Bougoüin, July 29, 1912.

tion kept its members clear, not only of directly evil societies, but of *neutral* organizations as well.[10] Later, through his Secretary of State, Pope Pius praised M. Durand because his society used supernatural means, particularly retreats, and because its policies "broke resolutely with the pernicious principle of religious neutrality and took on a character of exact and precise Catholicism."[11] In a parallel fashion the Baronessa de Montenach is congratulated for "the openly confessional character (*il carattere di aperta confessionalità*) of the society for the protection of girls which she headed.[12]

While these somewhat scattered pronouncements made the mind of Pope Piux X abundantly clear, it was particularly his policy toward the *Sillon* and the so-called Christian Trade Unions of Germany which showed the practical application of his doctrine. The *Sillon* was a French organization founded in the 1890's by a group of enthusiastic young people among whom Marc Sangnier was the most prominent. At first it was thoroughly Catholic and, as such, merited the praise of the Holy See. From about 1905 on, however, its character changed. "Liberal and Protestant infiltrations" appeared.[13] The staunch Catholicism of the *Sillon* degenerated into socio-religious intercredalism. Here was a queer paradox. The reconstruction of the social order was the *Sillon's* program. The Holy See had made it clear that Catholic truth was essential for the successful accomplishment of such an aim. Yet the *Sillon* attempted to carry out this *religious* work interconfessionally! As the Pope expressed it:

> Behold an interconfessional association founded by Catholics to work for the reform of civilization, a primarily religious task; for there is no true civilization without moral civilization and there is no true moral civilization without the true religion.[14]

If the *Sillon's* efforts had been directed toward some legitimate and restricted goal in the secular order, no one would have been shocked at its very mixed membership. No one is shocked because Catholics join hands with Protestants in the Urban League to improve race relations in America. But when the group task is "pri-

[10] Pope Pius X, Brief to Count Medolago Albani, March 19, 1904

[11] Cardinal Merry del Val, Letter to M. Durand, April 17, 1910.

[12] Cardinal Merry del Val, Letter to the Baronessa de Montenach, May 20, 1912.

[13] Pope Pius X, Letter, *Notre charge,* Aug. 25, 1910.

[14] *Ibid.*

marily religious" the Catholic member is in an awkward position. The group is interconfessional therefore he can hardly insist that it operate on a completely Catholic basis. The Church's social doctrine is only partially acceptable to his fellow-members. Therefore he is tempted to remain disingenuously silent. This is what happened in the *Sillon* and this is the point of the Pope's acid comment: "What is to be thought of a Catholic who, on entering his study club, checks his Catholicism at the door so as not to shock his comrades?"[15]

The *Sillon's* errors were many but its intercredalism was the primary error which opened the door to all the rest. As long as the society's membership and principles were thoroughly Catholic, it was above criticism. "The pernicious principle of religious neutrality" was its downfall. Once this had been accepted, many other errors followed. Fr. Murray enumerates these and repudiates them, one by one. But the root error he does not repudiate. He shares the vain hope that an intercredal organization can reform civilization, "a primarily religious task." Pope Pius X ridiculed the idea!

The history of the Christian Trade Unions of Germany goes back to 1894 when August Brust, a miner, organized an interconfessional union among his fellows in the Dortmund district. This example was soon followed by other trades. The next development was the formation of national unions in the separate trades; the miners took this step as early as 1897. Finally, the national unions formed a federation in 1901, the *Gesamtverband der christlichen Gewerkschaften Deutschlands.* Not all the unions joined the *Gesamtverband;* the latter had 284,649 members in 1907 out of a total Christian Trade Union membership of 365,000.[16] Not all Catholics accepted the idea of interconfessional unions. Around Berlin exclusively Catholic unions began to be organized. Soon the controversy between the proponents of the two different forms of unionism became acute.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Perhaps the best study of the Christian Trade Unions is Theodor Böhme, *Die christlich-nationale Gewerkschaft* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930). Maurice Kellershohn, *Le syndicalisme chrétien en Allemagne* (Paris: Bloud, 1912) is a spirited defense, hard to reconcile with the *Singulari quadam* which appeared the same year. A good study of German trade unonism in general is Robert Goetz, *Les syndicats ouvriers allemands après la guerre* (Paris: Domat-Montchrestien, 1934).

On September 24, 1912, Pope Pius authoritatively settled the dispute. He unreservedly praised the exclusively Catholic unions as the ideal. When it was necessary for Catholics and non-Catholics to co-operate for the common good, he preferred that they should do so on the principle of the *Cartel*, that is, an alliance (*foedus*) between distinct Catholic and non-Catholic organizations. However, on account of the existing conditions, he decided to tolerate the mixed unions. His words were:

> But in this case, Venerable Brethren, not a few of you request Us for permission to tolerate what are known as Christian Syndicates as they are now constituted in your diocese on the ground that they embrace many more workingmen than the purely Catholic associations and that serious disadvantages would result if this permission were withheld. We think it well to grant this petition in view of the peculiar position of the Church in Germany and We declare that they can be tolerated and that Catholics are permitted to join those mixed bodies also that exist in your dioceses, as long as new circumstances do not make such toleration either inopportune or unjust.[17]

Furthermore, as an antidote to the danger of interconfessionalism which he explicitly recognized, the Pope prescribed that Catholic members of the intercredal unions should be at the same time members of the exclusively Catholic *Arbeitsvereine* and he asked the bishops to watch developments with special care.

Fr. Murray has persuaded himself that the *Singulari quadam* was somehow a victory for the mixed unions. The Germans did not share this view. The general feeling is summed up by Erdmann: "The Encyclical did not contain a prohibition against the Christian Trade Unions, but it contained something much worse: the Christian Trade Unions were stamped with the stamp of religio-ethical inferiority."[18]

Fr. Murray feels that the Pope granted something more than mere toleration, namely, "toleration and permission." He translates the essential part of the quotation given above as follows: "We declare that Catholic participation may be tolerated and permitted also in those mixed associations which are found in your dioceses."[19]

[17] Pope Pius X, Encyclical, *Singulari quadam*, Sept. 24, 1912.

[18] *Die christlichen Gewerkschaften*, p. 161, *fide* Böhme, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[19] John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Intercredal Co-operation: Its Theory and Its Organization," *Theological Studies*, IV (1943), 257-86, p. 268.

Unfortunately, this translation does violence to the punctuation, the construction, and the context.[20] If the subtleties of Latin grammar appear unconvincing, the reader has only to look at the next clause where the Holy Father himself settles the matter completely by referring to his action as "toleration" (*tolerantia*). This one word would seem to destroy Fr. Murray's interpretation entirely. He solves the difficulty rather neatly by omitting the embarrassing word from his translation.[21] Fr. Murray refers to Pope Pius's action, sometimes as "toleration and permission," sometimes as "permission," and once as "a carefully phrased approval."[22] Obviously a document can be made to mean whatever one wishes under the sort of exegesis which can metamorphose "toleration" into "a carefully phrased approval"!

Under Pope Benedict XV the new Code was promulgated and it contained one rule which is relevant here. The third section of Canon 1325 reads:

> Caveant catholici ne disputationes vel collationes, publicas praesertim, cum acatholicis habeant, sine venia Sanctae Sedis aut, si casus urgeat, loci Ordinarii.

The prohibition includes "both disputations or debates, and friendly meetings or conferences which aim at agreement and concord."[23] Public meetings are affected directly (*publicas praesertim*); canon-

[20] The Latin text reads, "Putamus concedendum, declaramusque tolerari posse, et permitti catholicis, ut eas quoque societates mistas . . . participent." This in indirect discourse for the direct, "tolerari possunt, et permittitur catholicis ut . . ." This is clear from (1) The punctuation. The comma after *posse* would have no possible significance in Fr. Murray's translation. (2) The construction. The *ut*-clause depends on *permitti only*. "Permitti catholicis, ut . . ." ("Catholics are permitted to . . .") is a good construction. But "Tolerari . . . catholicis, ut . . ." ("Catholics are tolerated to . . .") would be strange. (3) The context. The bishops asked permission to *tolerate* the unions, the decision was "They can be tolerated," and the Pope goes on to refer to his action as "toleration."

[21] Latin text: "Quoad ex novis rerum adiunctis non desinat huiusmodi tolerantia aut opportuna esse aut iusta." Fr. Murray's translation: "So long as this does not cease to be advantageous and lawful" (instead of "this toleration"). See reference of footnote 19 above.

[22] John Courtney Murray, S.J., "On the Problem of Co-operation: Some Clarifications," *AER*, CXII, 3 (March, 1945), 200.

[23] T. Lincoln Bouscaren, "Co-operation with Non-Catholics: Canonical Legislation," *Theological Studies*, III (1942), 475-512, p. 504.

ists do not agree exactly on its application to private discussions. A discussion is public "if it overflows the limits of the private or family circle."[24] From the context it seems clear that disputations and meetings fall under this rule only if they deal with matters of faith. Clearly Catholics can discuss mathematics with Protestants in public with no special permission. They can also discuss the purely secular aspects of social questions, say, a social security law or improved law enforcement. If, however, the bearing of religious truth on social questions were to be discussed, for example, in seeking a common religious ground between Catholics and non-Catholics for attacking the problems of society, such permission would undoubtedly be necessary. In 1902 Rome declared that "since the tenets of Socialism, taken in their entirety, contain real heresies," Catholics were prohibited from taking part in public discussions without permission by the legislation existing at the time.[25]

Pope Pius XI in many documents emphasized the necessity of using revealed truth for solving social problems. Since the same thing had been said many times by previous pontiffs, it is unnecessary to cite the texts here. Two documents, however, have a more immediate bearing on the present topic. An instruction of 1929 made it clear that the *Cartel* principle was to be used only in seeking *specific* objects through *temporary* alliances.[26] Thus the principle of the Cartel, commended in the *Singulari quadam,* could not be made an excuse for a permanent union of Catholic and non-Catholic unions into an intercredal federation. In the *Quadragesimo anno* Pope Pius gave bishops permission to *approve*—here it was not a question of *toleration*—the membership of Catholics in neutral trade unions (*syndicatus neutri*).[27]

In reviewing the series of documents quoted, it is important to note that the Holy See expresses a carefully graded series of atti-

[24] *Ibid.,* p. 505.

[25] Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Instruction on Democratic-Christian Action in Italy, Jan. 27, 1902. Cited by Bouscaren, *op. cit.,* p. 510. This document did not apply to the United States. It is quoted here merely to prove that in the mind of Rome, such a thing as "the tenets of Socialism, taken in their entirety" should be regarded as involving matters of faith for the purpose of interpreting Canon 1325.

[26] Sacred Congregation of the Council, ad. R. P. D. Achilleum Liénart, Episcopum Insulensem, June 5, 1929.

[27] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.

tudes toward organizations which admit the danger of socio-religious intercredalism in varying measure:

(1) Purely Catholic organizations for social reconstruction are *praised unreservedly.* It would be possible to cite any number of additional documents to prove this. It is easy to understand the Holy See's attitude. Society can be reformed fully only on a religious basis. Only the Catholic Church has the true faith. Only a Catholic organization is in a position to apply the complete remedy.

(2) Where circumstances call for co-operation between Catholics and non-Catholics, the Holy See *recommends* the Cartel principle but it must be used only temporarily and for specific objects.

(3) Bishops are allowed to *approve* neutral unions (*syndicatus neutri*) when they are made necessary by circumstances.

(4) The Holy See *tolerates* the intercredalism of the Christian Trade Unions (*societates mistae*) of Germany.

(5) The Holy See *condemns* the intercredalism of the *Sillon.*

To understand the attitude of Rome toward socio-religious intercredalism we must seek some principle which will explain this carefully graded scale of attitudes. What factor is it whose presence makes the Cartel less than ideal; the neutral union, subject to approbation; the Christian Trade Unions, merely tolerable; and the *Sillon* worthy of outright condemnation?

Obviously the vitiating factor cannot be the mere simultaneous performance of good works by Catholics and non-Catholics. If it is praiseworthy for a Catholic to fight for a living wage, then his action does not become evil by the mere fact that a non-Catholic fights beside him. There is not the slightest hint in the Roman texts of a general condemnation of co-operation between Catholics and others for social reform. On the contrary Fr. Parsons has clearly shown that the Holy See praises such collaboration.[28] For many years the writer has played a rather active, if extremely modest, part in various nonsectarian organizations for the relief of poverty, the improvement of race relations, the furthering of international peace, and for divers other good causes.

No, the popes do not discourage the collaboration of Catholics and non-Catholics in general; but they definitely do discourage some specific forms of such collaboration. What is the underlying prin-

[28] Wilfrid Parsons, "Intercredal Co-operation in the Papal Documents," *Theological Studies,* IV (1943), 159-82.

ciple here? As in other instances of co-operation with heretics, the solution must be sought in the danger to the faith which is involved. Indeed, Pope Pius X explicitly stated this danger in the case of the Catholic members of the German mixed unions: "For unless they are promptly aroused and put on their guard, there is obviously a danger that gradually and almost without realizing it they may accept a certain vague and undefined type of Christianity which is usually called *interconfessional.*"[29]

It is easy to understand this danger. There is, after all, little more than a nominal distinction between the acts of a man as an individual and his acts as a member of society. Nearly all our acts are in some way social. Even our most secret thoughts are likely to affect our social attitudes sooner or later. A code of principles regulating the relations of man and society is thus related in a very intimate way to a code regulating his individual life. A code of social principles, partly ethical and partly religious, worked out in common between Catholics and non-Catholics comes very near to being a philosophy of life. If *socio-religious intercredalism* be defined as a program of social reform based on such a common ethico-religious code, to be applied by an intercredal organization, then it may be said that socio-religious intercredalism is the one danger which determines the varying papal attitudes towards inter-religious organizations for social reform.

When Catholics work in purely Catholic organizations, the danger of such intercredalism is absent and the Holy See is warm in its praise. Alliances between Catholic and non-Catholic groups in the form of a temporary Cartel involve only a very remote danger; therefore such alliances can be recommended when necessary. Neutral trade unions, such as exist in the United States, are not very ideological. Experience has shown that Catholic members do not tend to pick up a new philosophy of life from their membership. Under proper circumstances they can be approved. The mixed trade unions of Germany involved real dangers as the Pope stated explicitly. However, they were not much given to theorizing[30] and

[29] *Singulari quadam.*

[30] As an important official stated, "The Christian Trade Unions by statute (*statutgemäss*) limit their activity to the handling of practical questions of an economic character." Cited in Joseph Mausbach, *Die katholiche Moral und ihre Gegner* (Köln: Bachem, 1913), p. 394.

their membership was about 85 per cent Catholic.[31] The unions were wrong in principle but rather harmless in practice; the Pope could afford to tolerate them. In the case of the *Sillon* socio-religious intercredalism was more than a danger; it was an accomplished fact and had already led to further errors. Rome had no alternative but to condemn it.

Fr. Murray aids the discussion greatly by raising the question, What is to be thought of joint declarations on some social question, such as international peace, signed by Catholics and representatives of other faiths? Three cases might be considered. (1) The purely secular aspects of the question are involved. In this case there would certainly be no difficulty. (2) The religious aspects of the question are explicitly included. Since the joint declaration would probably have to be preceded by discussions, the provisions of Canon 1325 would seem to apply and the decision would rest with Rome or, in case of necessity, with the local Ordinary. If the venture promised helpful results and if only certain particular issues were involved, the necessary permissions would doubtless be granted. To publish the fact that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews agree on certain specific issues hardly encourages intercredalism. After all, it would be hard to find two systems of social philosophy which disagreed on *every* point. (3) The joint declaration covers a broad field of social thought and is intended as the basis of a permanent organization in which men of different faiths will work in indiscriminate union for social reform on this ethico-religious common ground. Here the provisions of Canon 1325 would still apply and it seems quite certain that Rome would withhold permission; for, as the present review of the documents shows, the Holy See has uniformly discouraged this form of intercerdalism.

Reading Fr. Murray, one feels sympathy for his generous social idealism and his enthusiasm for social reconstruction; yet it is hard to avoid the conviction that for the attainment of his purpose he has chosen precisely the one form of intercredal co-operation which the Holy See has uniformly discouraged. For it is characterized as follows: (1) It is "an organizational unity that will be both

[31]Yves de la Brière, "L'encyclique *Singulari quadam* sur les syndicats confessionels et interconfessionels," *Études,* CXXXIII (1912), 700-712, p. 701.

spiritual and interconfessional,"[32] "a religio-social unity."[33] (2) It is based on a common set of principles, partly religious and partly ethical, "a common ground on which interconfessional co-operation may be based,"[34] an "interconfessional agreement on certain necessary religious and moral bases of a just social order."[35] (3) Being intercredal it is removed "from organic relation to [the Church's] pastoral authority."[36]

Is not this precisely the sort of thing which Rome has uniformly discouraged? Is not this to introduce "the pernicious principle of religious neutrality" in social action? Is not this "the sort of confessional neutrality" whose object is "to take in the maximum possible number of participants with the minimum possible number of supernatural conditions"? Is not this to attempt to set up an interconfessional organization precisely "to work for the reform of civilization, a primarily religious task"?

If Fr. Murray still feels that Rome encourages the specific form of intercredal co-operation which he advocates, then let him cite one papal document which not merely tolerates but encourages intercredal organization with the three specific marks mentioned above. In particular, let him find one papal document which encourages Catholics to work out with heretics a *partly religious* set of common principles on which to base their joint action. When Fr. Murray can find one such papal document, the present writer will be glad to resume the discussion. Until then it may best be regarded as closed.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[32] John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Intercredal Co-operation: Its Theory and Its Organization," *Theological Studies,* IV (1943), 260.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 274.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

MISSION INTENTION

"The edification of progressive Eastern nations by European Christians" is the Mission Intention for the month of May, 1945.

A NEW WEAPON FOR CATHOLIC APOLOGETIC

Early last February the Russian Orthodox Church and representatives of some other Eastern dissident communities made a vicious attack on the Holy Father. This onslaught drew an immediate, highly articulate, and effective response from Catholics throughout the world. The intense loyalty of our Lord's disciples towards the man whom the Master has placed in charge of the Church has seldom been manifested more clearly than in the vigorous reaction of the Catholic press and people. Catholic writers had little trouble in showing the inherent inanity of the statements made by the Orthodox dignitaries. The men who made the attack at least gave the world an opportunity to see something of the depth and spontaneity of the affection which Catholics have for the Holy Father.

Now that the air has cleared, we can more readily understand that the resentment of Catholics throughout the world against the fabricators of the anti-Papal documents in Moscow was perfectly justified. The all-pervading and all-too-frequently fictional excuse of "good faith" can hardly be alleged in favor of the Orthodox prelates in this matter. They set out to pronounce on the conditions of that peace which was to come as a result of an allied victory and sought to destroy the Holy Father's influence on that peace. At the moment when they were shrieking their insults against the Pope, the Army of the United States, with millions of its members venerating the Bishop of Rome as the Vicar of Christ on earth, was winning the very victory which was making the peace possible. The millions of Catholic men in the free American army were certainly not fighting to have the Holy Father's voice silenced in the making of the new order. In setting their petty personal hatreds above the rights of these heroes, the Patriarchs at Moscow were exhibiting the sort of bad taste only expected from an English actor discussing wounded soldiers from Brooklyn.

The attack by the Orthodox prelates from Moscow made a very fine "sitting duck' for Catholic literary nimrods. It was very easy to show that the Holy Father was not opposed to the proper punishment of war criminals. It was easy likewise to adduce evidence showing that the Vicar of Christ had not displayed an un-neutral partiality for Germany, even during the time when the German

armies, with better than tacit support from Russia, were winning battles regularly. Some of the Catholic publicists took occasion to bring up the Russian Dissidents' old and shameful record of slavish subjection to secular authority. As a matter of fact, Catholic polemic against this particular attack was so spectacularly successful that many of our scholars have succumbed to the temptation to regard the statements of the Orthodox prelates as a dead issue, something which can be abandoned now that its news value has been lost.

This is, however, an attitude which we can definitely not afford to adopt. The Orthdox Churches' protest against the Holy Father can be and should be a valuable weapon in the missionary arsenal of the Catholic Church. It is not one of those attacks which are worth no more than casual attention, once they have been refuted. It is something which the Catholic Church can use effectively in carrying out its divine commission to preach our Lord's message to all the men of this world.

TWO PLANS FOR CATHOLIC POLEMIC

There are two distinct ways of dealing with attacks made against the Catholic Church or against its visible head on earth. The first method deals only with the allegations contained immediately in the charges themselves. The Catholic controversialist who adopts this program sets out to demonstrate the falsity and the injustice contained directly in the anti-Catholic document. He brings out evidence to show that the individual arguments against the Church are invalid. Most of the Catholic reaction to the Orthodox outburst against the Vicar of Christ took this form.

This method has definite advantages. It serves to destroy misconceptions which might otherwise engender opposition to the Church on the part of those whom God calls to live within it. Indirectly it brings out the essential truth of the Church's claims by showing the error involved in any objection made against them. But it is and it remains something inherently negative. It destroys falsehood without positively preparing the way for the acceptance of Catholic truth.

The other method of dealing with the charges made against the true Church of Jesus Christ is to make the attacks themselves instruments for the victorious missionary polemic of the Church. This is the classical procedure in Catholic literary history. The pro-

ponents of Catholic truth, particularly during times of great stress in the lifetime of the Church, have never been content merely to expose the falseness of charges hurled by enemies against the City of God. They have used the attacks in such a way as to enable people the better to understand, in the light of the hostile statements themselves, that the Christian message is a doctrine that all men should hold, and that the Catholic Church is the society within which all men should live. Because they used this method, the polemic works of the classical Catholic apologists and controversialists have an enduring value for the student of Christian truth. Those, on the other hand, who have contented themselves with the bare task of discrediting the individual attacks against the Church have left works which were of little service to the Church once the news interest of the particular attacks in question had vanished.

St. Justin Martyr was not satisfied with showing the inanity of the shameful accusations brought by the pagans against the Christians of his time. In his two Apologies he made the refutation of these charges into a strong argument in favor of the Christian religion and the Christian Church. So, too, each in his own way, did Tertullian in his *Apologeticus,* Minucius Felix in his *Octavius,* and Clement of Alexandria in his *Exhortation to the Greeks.* In his *Dialogue with Trypho,* St. Justin, through a consideration of the anti-Christian polemic of the Jews, managed to make his readers understand quite clearly that our Lord was actually the Messias expected by the Hebrew nation, and that the Church of Jesus Christ was actually the New Israel, foretold by the ancient prophets. Tertullian, in his *De praescriptione haereticorum* and St. Irenaeus in his *Adversus haereses* used the contentions of the heretics themselves as instruments to aid people in understanding the correctness of the Catholic position.

The same procedure can be observed in the writings of the great Counter-Reformation theologians. Thus James Latomus of Louvain wrote effectively against Martin Luther and against Oecolampadius, but his dissertations against the teachings of these heresiarchs were so constructed as to bring out most effectively the essential correctness of the Catholic teaching. His confrere, John Driedo, took the errors of the Reformers and made them signposts in the teaching of God's truth. Forty years after Latomus and Driedo had written, the same method was carried to perfection in

the works of the two greatest Catholic controversialists. Thomas Stapleton and St. Robert Bellarmine faithfully incorporated into their writings all of the salient points of Protestant teachings. They used them in such a way as to make it clear that these doctrines could not be considered as the divine message, and that the institutions which propounded them could have no claim to the title of God's Church. The Church was vindicated, not only *from,* but *through,* the attacks of its enemies.

The great and manifest danger to the Catholic Church today makes it imperative that we should adopt this same method in dealing with the adversaries of the Church of God and of the Holy See. In the face of a clamorous and hostile world around us, we have no right to indulge ourselves in the luxury of mere resentment against attacks on the Catholic Church. As perhaps never before in the lifetime of the Catholic Church, we need to focus the minds of our fellow men on the all-important truth that our Church has no merely political destiny, but is the organization divinely founded as the necessary agency for all men who are to attain the beatific vision. The attacks of the Orthodox Patriarchs against the Holy Father can be of great service to us in fulfilling this obligation.

If we take the trouble to compare the official documents in which the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Churches attacked the Holy Father with the Pontifical pronouncements on the same subject matter, we shall find evidence that the Oriental dignitaries, far from preaching the message and following the tradition of our Lord, are actually engaged in contradicting that message and that tradition. We shall see, on the other hand, that the Holy Father's teaching on these same points is manifestly the doctrine of Christ. The comparison will certainly aid serious men in realizing that, as a matter of fact, the Catholic Church alone is the exponent of our Lord's teaching in the world today.

Thus, while from the standpoint of news, the Orthodox attack on the Vicar of Christ is already a dead issue, that same attack can and should be used as a resource in the essential missionary work of the Catholic Church. Obviously we cannot expect anything like a complete and independent apologetic from a study of the Russian Church declarations. Still, although the evidence which they offer for the truth of the Catholic position is not the most important, it is something vital and contemporary, something which the men of our time can ill afford to miss.

THE MOSCOW ASSEMBLY

The anti-Papal campaign of the Dissident Oriental churchmen centered around an assembly or *sobor* of the Russian Orthodox Church, called for the purpose of electing the leftist Archbishop Alexius as "Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia." Representatives of some other schismatic Eastern Churches attended the gathering as guests of honor. The *sobor* had been planned by Alexius' predecessor, the Patriarch Sergius, famed for his many and inept attacks on the Holy See. One of the members of the Russian Orthodox hierarchy, one Benjamin Fedchenkov, who rejoices in the title "Metropolitan of North America and the Aleutians," told American reporters that Sergius had originally planned to hold the affair "in refutation of the claims of the Vatican that Papal Rome is a divinely appointed and necessary center of Christian unity and authority."[1] The death of Sergius, however, made the election of his successor the primary and immediate function of his *sobor.*

The election of Alexius to Sergius' old post took place with that prudent unanimity which seems characteristic of such events in the realm of Comrade Stalin. On Feb. 2, the day of Alexius' election, the *sobor* despatched a message to Christians throughout the world. Eight days later the Soviet press released still another message, this time to the peoples of the world. The second message came from Alexius himself, and from the representatives of the other patriarchates which had accepted invitations to the assembly. The second message denounced the Vatican by name. The first document, that of the Russian Church, inveighs against a class within which the "message to the peoples of the world" places the Sovereign Pontiff.

The pertinent section of the "message to the peoples of the world," published by the Soviet press on Feb. 10, is thus translated by the Russian Embassy's *Information Bulletin.*

> The representatives of the Orthodox Autocephalous Churches who attended the Assembly of the Russian Orthodox Church convened in Moscow for the election of the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, taking into consideration the present international situation, raise their voices against the efforts of those—in particular the Vatican—who by attempting in their public speeches to shield Hitlerite Germany from

[1] *Newsweek,* XXV, 4 (Jan. 26, 1945), 82 f.

responsibility for all the crimes she has committed, and by appealing for mercy for the Hitlerites who have drenched all Europe in the blood of their innocent victims, desire by this means, in our opinion, to permit the fascist misanthropic anti-Christian doctrine and those who sow it to remain on earth after the war.[2]

The message was signed by Christophor, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria; by Alexander III, Patriarch of Antioch and all the Orient; by Alexius, Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia; by Kallistrat, Catholicos and Patriarch of all Georgia; by Hermanos, Metropolitan of Phiatir and representative of the Universal Patriarch of Constantinople; by Athenogor, Archbishop of Sebastia and representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem; by Joseph, Metropolitan of Skoplje and representative of the Serbian Patriarch; and by Joseph, Bishop of Argesh and representative of the Rumanian Patriarch.

The corresponding section of the Russian Orthodox Church's message "to Christians all over the world" should be studied along with the Patriarch's declaration.

Yet meanwhile voices are heard, calling upon us in the name of forgiveness to have mercy and forgive infanticides and traitors. Such appeals come from people who have the temerity to regard themselves as Christians. Thus these people, who in the words of the Apostle are partakers of these sins, subject themselves to the same condemnation as the fascists who plunge their victims in blood. . . .[3]

There can be no doubt whatsoever about the identity of at least one of the "voices . . . heard calling upon us in the name of forgiveness to have mercy and to forgive infanticides and traitors." The united Patriarchs single out the Holy Father as particularly guilty of "appealing for mercy for the Hitlerites," and there is no reason whatsoever to imagine that Alexius and his helpers had anyone else in view in framing the paragraph we have cited from the message of the Russian Orthodox Church. The schismatics' attack on the Holy Father must be considered in the light of both documents.

[2] *Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Information Bulletin*, V, 19 (Feb. 15, 1945), 7.

[3] *Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Information Bulletin*, V, 18 (Feb. 13, 1945), 5 f.

SUMMARY OF THE ORTHODOX ATTACK

The two documents we have quoted show that the representatives of the Dissident Eastern Churches accuse the Holy Father of certain definite faults, suspect him of another, and impose a definite judgment and sentence upon him.

(1) His Holiness Pope Pius XII is charged with the heinous offence of trying to shield a vanquished enemy nation from responsibility for all the crimes the Patriarchs think she has committed. Moreover it is alleged that he has appealed for mercy for the conquered foe. He stands accused of calling upon righteous fellows like the Russian Orthodox prelates "in the name of forgiveness to have mercy and forgive infanticides and traitors."

(2) Alexius and his friends, however, suspect the Holy Father of a crime far worse than what they regard as the essentially anti-Christian preaching of mercy and forgiveness. In their opinion, they tell us, this talk of mercy and forgiveness seems to indicate that the Vicar of Christ wishes "to permit the fascist misanthropic anti-Christian doctrine and those who sow it to remain on earth after the war." To translate from the genially rich Communist vocabulary into a more sober and technical English, the "fascist doctrine" is any teaching which disapproves of Communism. We must not forget that the messages of the Patriarchs were written in the phraseology of a Communist organization. To the Communist, any person who works against the party or against the doctrine set forth by the party is a Fascist. Men who have nothing whatsoever to do with and who heartily disapprove of the political parties and philosophies properly known as Fascist find themselves condemned as Fascists whenever they come into conflict with the Communist party or with the Party Line.

In the eyes of the Patriarchs, then, the Holy Father remains suspect of wanting to have at least some anti-Leninist doctrine and a few non-Communists remain in the land of the living after the conclusion of hostilities. In all justice to the *sobor* we must remember that it does not accuse the Holy Father of opposing the just punishment of war criminals. It does not seem to be concerned with that matter at all. Its fury is unleashed against the general aggregate of anti-Communist teachings and teachers. The Patriarchs sorrowfully complain that they believe the Holy Father opposed to the indiscriminate destruction of these doctrines and their exponents.

(3) The judgment against the Holy Father is quite severe, even for such stringent moralists as the Orthodox prelates. Alexius and his associates believe that he has made himself a partaker of the Fascists' sins, which consist for the most part, apparently, of infanticide and high treason. He is numbered among those who "subject themselves to the same condemnation as the Fascists who plunge their victims in blood." With this highly colorful list of offenses to his credit, he is, according to the *sobor,* not a real Christian at all, but only one of the unfortunate people "who have the temerity to regard themselves as Christians."

In all of this, however, we must make allowance for the vigorous imagery of Communist expression. There is no reason whatsoever to suspect that Alexius, Christophor, or any of their associates were under the illusion that the Holy Father had ever issued any special appeals in favor of baby-killers or of betrayers of their country. Indeed, Alexius may well have signed the message with his tongue in his cheek, remembering the contrast between the Catholic attitude towards abortion and the somewhat tolerant sentiments of the Communist government towards the same crime, at least until a few years ago. The criminal names are simply a part of the Communist invective against enemies. For these enemies, whether of his country or of the political doctrine which rules his country, Alexius wants neither mercy nor forgiveness.

THE TEACHING OF POPE PIUS XII

Over against the declarations of the Dissident Patriarchs we should place the pronouncements of the Holy Father. He, too, has issued a warning about decisions which will have to be made after hostilities have ceased. As a matter of fact he made this pronouncement in the Encyclical *Summi pontificatus,* issued on Oct. 20, 1939. At this time the German armies were quite successful, and there was certainly no sign of a protest against them on the part of the Communist government—which less than two months before had signed a pact with the now hated Hitlerites. Pius XII wrote in favor of moderation and justice.

> The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is in equal measure the hour of temptation. In this hour the angel of justice strives with the demon of violence; the

heart of the victor all too easily is hardened; moderation and far-seeing wisdom appear to him weakness; the excited passions of the people, often inflamed by the sacrifices and sufferings they have borne, obscure the vision even of responsible persons and make them inattentive to the warning voice of humanity and equity, which is overwhelmed or drowned in the inhuman cry, "*Vae victis,* Woe to the conquered." There is danger lest settlements and decisions born in such conditions be nothing else than injustice under the cloak of justice.[4]

The two documents from Moscow show very clearly the attitude of the schismatic Patriarchs towards the Vicar of Christ. We find his sentiments in their regard expressed in the glorious Encyclical *Orientalis Ecclesiae decus,* of April 9, 1944.

Let them understand that We are motivated by the same charity as Our predecessors, and that We intend especially by Our continued prayers and supplications that the day may finally come when the ancient obstacles have been cleared away and there is one flock in one fold, with heartfelt concord subject to Jesus Christ and to His Vicar on earth.[5]

Finally, to compare the Pontifical teaching with that of the schismatic Patriarchs, we should consider the Holy Father's doctrine on the punishment of war criminals. It is set forth in the Christmas Message of 1944. Two passages are most pertinent to our purpose. In the first the Holy Father speaks of repressive measures to be taken against the vanquished nations held responsible for the war.

That any peoples, to whose Government—or perhaps even partially to themselves—the responsibility of the war is attributed, should have for a time to undergo the rigors of security measures until the bonds of mutual trust, violently broken, should be gradually welded together again, is quite understandable from a human point of view, and in practice will in all probability be inevitable.[6]

The second passage deals with real war criminals. It is to be remembered that the Patriarchs really made no pronouncement on this point. They shriek for the destruction of what they call

[4] This passage is included in *Principles for Peace,* n. 1435.

[5] *AAS,* XXXVI 1 (1944), 143.

[6] Quoted from the official English translation in the official organ of the Diocese of Hartford, *The Catholic Transcript,* XLVII, 32 (Dec. 28, 1944), 7.

Fascism. They have no particular message about just punishment for actual crime. The Holy Father's teaching on this point follows:

> No one certainly thinks of disarming justice in its relations to those who have exploited the war situation in order to commit real and proven crimes against the common law, and for whom supposed military necessity could at most have offered a pretext, but never a justification.
>
> But if justice presumed to judge and punish not merely individuals but even whole communities together, who could not see in such a procedure a violation of the norms which guide every human trial?[7]

THE POINT OF THE COMPARISON

The Pontifical statements we have adduced clearly express three elements: an intense charity, a hunger and thirst for justice, and a definite independence of and superiority to the merely political forces of this world. On the other hand the documents from the Moscow conferees manifest a clear hatred for a considerable portion of the human race, a contempt for justice, and an unabashed subservience to political power. Both sets of documents must be considered as official statements of the religious societies headed by the authors of these documents. The Holy Father is the unquestioned head of the Catholic Church. The message of Feb. 2 was sent out by the *sobor* of the Russian Orthodox Church, presided over by the newly elected Patriarch Alexius. The message of Feb. 10 comes from the heads of many of the most important Autocephalous Orthodox Churches in the East. It follows, of course, that, here and now, the sentiments expressed in the schismatic declarations constitute the official teaching of these societies on the points at issue if there is such a thing as any official contemporary teaching in these societies. Likewise the teaching of the Holy Father is the official and accurate expression of the doctrine of the society which He heads as the Vicar of Christ on earth.

Once we have ascertained the contrary teachings of these two societies, we have only to compare them both with the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ. The contrast between the Catholic and the Autocephalous teachings is so sharp that we can content ourselves with the use of only one of the two sources of revelation, the inspired Scripture. If the doctrine of one of these two religious societies proves to be manifestly contrary to our Lord's express

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

teaching, as this is brought out in the gospels, then it follows that this society is not the true Church of God. If, on the contrary, the other society be found to teach what is manifestly the doctrine preached by our Lord during the course of His earthly life, then there is nothing to prevent this society from being considered as His Church.

Now it is a cardinal principle in the teaching of our Lord that His followers are to love all men, even their own enemies.

> You have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.
>
> But I say to you: Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you: and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you:
>
> That you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven, who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and bad and raineth upon the just and the unjust.[8]

The attitude and the teaching of the Orthodox prelates is in clear opposition to this basic command of Christ. The Church, or to be more exact, the Churches, whose official doctrine is expressed in the messages of these prelates, contradicts our Lord's message. It is not the Church of God.

On the contrary, the attitude of the Catholic Church, set forth in the teaching of the Holy Father, is clearly conformed to our Lord's mandate. He begs God in favor of these men who have manifested nothing but hatred for him and his Church. He prays for the graces that will bring them to that position in which they will serve our Lord effectively in this world, so as to be able to possess God forever in heaven. While they seek to involve him in the ruin of their enemies, he strives, and the Church over which he presides strives with him, to procure for these, his enemies, the greatest gift which man can receive, the gift of eternal life. This man, and this Church, are in the company of Jesus Christ.

Our Lord was perfectly clear on the obligation of seeking justice. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice," He said, "for they shall have their fill."[9] He issued this command to His followers: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice."[10]

The Moscow messages involve an absolute abandonment of our Lord's teaching on this point. They manifest no concern for jus-

[8] *Matt.* 5:43-45. [9] *Matt.* 5:6. [10] *Matt.* 6:33.

tice whatsoever. There is only a rancorous and hysterical anxiety that no one who has sowed the anti-Communist doctrine will remain on earth after the war. There is brazen prevarication about the Holy Father. The underlying motive of hatred for the enemies of the political regime upon which the Patriarchs depend for their support has wiped out all concern for God's justice in their declarations. This support, disdainfully given and cringingly accepted, has impelled them to demand the mass ruin of their foes.

On the contrary, the Holy Father exhibits our Lord's own concern for justice. At the very beginning of the present war, he cautioned against precipitate judgments after victory, on the ground that, in such judgments, the virtue of justice might be violated. He acknowledges the necessity of punishment for war criminals, but puts forward the just and Christian observation that this punishment must be visited only on men who have offended against the common law, and whose offenses have been proved. The inhuman cry of "*Vae victis,*" which the Holy Father feared might overmaster the appeal of justice itself, has seldom been given a more shocking expression than in the messages from the Patriarchs in Moscow.

Our Lord demanded a love of justice on the part of His followers. The ecclesiastical group which calls for the ruin of its political enemies, regardless of individual guilt, is manifestly not delivering the message of Christ. The Holy Father, in demanding punishment for real crime, whenever and by whomever it is perpetrated, shows himself the bearer of the Christian message.

Our Lord stated unequivocally: "My kingdom is not of this world."[11] The religious society which renders itself subservient to any political government is not the society which our Lord called His kingdom. The Russian Orthodox prelates, and the other ecclesiastical leaders who united with Alexis in sending the message of Feb. 10, acted as the assistants in a political device of a national government. The policy which they followed was the traditional method of their own Autocephalous Churches. Such organizations are not the true Church of Jesus Christ.

The attacks on the Holy Father by the Orthodox Autocephalous prelates were part of a complex campaign engineered by the Russian government for the purpose of excluding the Holy Father's

[11] *John* 18:36.

influence from the peace to come. The Holy Father, on the contrary, acts as the agent of no government nor group of governments. He asks for justice, since he is the Vicar of Christ, the God of justice. The Church for which he speaks in this way also manifests itself as the kingdom of God on earth.

THE BOOMERANG OF PATRIARCH SERGIUS

According to the "Metropolitan of North America and the Aleutians," the late Sergius intended to hold a *sobor* "in refutation of the claims of the Vatican that Papal Rome is a divinely appointed and necessary center of Christian unity and authority." Mindful, perhaps, of the memory of the departed Patriarch, the *sobor* qualified the persons who appealed (as did our Lord Himself) for mercy and forgiveness as "people who have the temerity to regard themselves as Christians." Since the next document, the message of the Patriarchs to the peoples of the world, placed the Holy Father among the persons who seek forgiveness, the action of the *sobor* resolves itself into an oblique sort of insult against the Holy Father. Manifestly this was about as far as the members could go in forming the "refutation" so desired by their dead leader.

The only reason why no refutation was forthcoming was the very simple fact that no refutation was possible. As a matter of fact, however, the cohorts of Alexius did the Catholic Church a signal favor. They provided a vital and contemporary refutation of their own contentions and of their own position. They have given evidence to the world that the man who seeks to live as a follower of Jesus Christ will not find the fellowship of Christ in their communion. If there could be any such thing as a Christian unity independent of Papal Rome, it would certainly be among those who have at least preserved a valid episcopate, such as that possessed by the prelates of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches. Since the fellowship of Christ and the message of Christ are not to be found in their societies, the members of the Orthodox assembly provide a very concrete and powerful demonstration of the fact that Papal Rome must be the necessary and divinely appointed center of Christian unity.

The *sobor* shows very clearly that there is a certain unity among the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches. The messages sent by the *sobor* give unmistakable evidence that it is not a *Christian* unity.

The society in which the true Christian unity is manifest, through its doctrine and its practice, is the one which the Bishop of Rome rules as the Vicar of Christ on earth. For those who seek unity in Christ, the *sobor* has offered evidence which can and should lead to truth.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

BISHOP FENWICK AND TOM PAINE

One of the most interesting events in Father Fenwick's life was his visit to Tom Paine, the infidel philosopher. Father Kohlman accompanied him. . . . The two Jesuits went to Paine's residence, and were met at the door by the housekeeper, who informed them that he was asleep, and expressed a wish that he might not be disturbed.

"He is always in bad humor," she added, "when roused out of his sleep — 'tis better to wait a little till he be awake." They quietly sat down and resolved to wait. The woman at some length described the miseries of the famous infidel. When alone he would cry: *"O Lord, help me."* Or again, *"God help me."* Then shortly after: *"But there is no God."* And again, a little after: *"Yet if there should be, what will become of me hereafter?"* In his agony and terror he would cry for some one to come near him. *"Send even a child,"* he would say, *"to stay with me, for it is hell to be alone."*

When Paine awoke, the priests were shown into his room. "A more wretched being in appearance," writes Father Fenwick, "I never before beheld."

Father Kohlman, as the elder and the more experienced, opened the conversation. He had not proceeded far when Paine said: "I wish to hear no more from you, sir. I look upon the whole of the Christian scheme to be a tissue of absurdities and lies, and *J. C.* to be nothing more than a cunning knave and imposter." Father Kohlman attempted to speak again, but Paine sternly interrupted him. Then Father Fenwick, in a mild tone, commenced to reason with him. Paine now got enraged. "Begone," said he, "and trouble me no more." His mouth frothed, and he shook the bed with rage and madness. They were unable to make any impression on him, and after some moments withdrew. "I never before or since," says Father Fenwick, "beheld a more hardened wretch."

—John O'Kane Murray, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York: D. and J. Sadlier and Co., 1876), p. 274 f.

Answers to Questions

ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM TO UNKNOWN DYING PERSONS

Question: What is possible in the matter of administering Baptism to a person who is dying unconscious, when nothing is known of his religious affiliations or beliefs?

Answer: This is one of the most difficult problems in moral theology. Before attempting a solution, we must have a precise knowledge of all the circumstances. The question does not concern a dying unbaptized non-Catholic who is known to have had some religious belief or to have led a good life. Even if such a person showed no propensity toward Christianity, it seems quite probable that Baptism could be administered conditionally when he is unconscious and there is no hope that he will recover the use of his senses before death. Although some theologians, like Prümmer (*Manuale Theologiae Moralis* [Fribourg, 1936], III, n. 135), take a stricter view and demand a more explicit manifestation of a desire to receive the sacrament of regeneration by such a person, others with Damen (*Theologia Moralis* [Turin, 1939], II, n. 32) admit the probability of this view, on the grounds that his religious belief and practice, of whatever nature they may have been, sufficiently constitute an implicit desire of using the means necessary for salvation, the chief of which is Baptism. In practice, a priest could safely baptize such a person conditionally. In the event that the dying person is known to have been a baptized non-Catholic, in the same circumstances conditional absolution and Extreme Unction could be given (Kilker, *Extreme Unction* [St. Louis ,1927], pp. 124 ff.). And, since there is usually considerable doubt as to the validity of non-Catholic baptisms, a conditional administration of Baptism (*Si capax es*) would usually precede the other two sacraments.

However, the question at hand is more difficult. Here we are dealing with a person whose religious beliefs and practises are entirely unknown, like the man who is brought to a hospital dying from an accident, completely unconscious. Moreover, we are not

concerned with a country in which practically all the citizens are Catholics, as in a South American land. For, in this event, the presumption that the dying person is a member of the Catholic Church would justify the giving of absolution and Extreme Unction, at least conditionally. But we are concerned with a land, like our own, in which Catholics are in the great minority, and in which many of the rest of the population have no religious belief or practice. What can be done by a priest in the matter of administering the sacraments to a person in the condition described?

The Code lays down the general principle that an adult may not be baptized, except knowingly and willingly, and after having been properly instructed and admonished to repent of his sins. It then goes on to qualify this principle in the case of a person in danger of death. A general acceptance of the chief mysteries of the Christian faith and a serious promise to observe the commandments of the Christian religion suffice, if more adequate instruction is impossible. Indeed, if the dying person cannot ask for Baptism, it suffices for the conditional administration of the sacrament that in some probable way he now manifest his intention of receiving it, or has given such a manifestation previously (Canon 752).

There are some theologians who believe it possible to reconcile this prescription of Church law with the custom of baptizing any unknown dying person, unable to give any sign of the desire to receive the sacrament. Genicot-Salsmans believe that a priest would not be blamed if he followed this practice on the grounds that God wills all to be saved, and that the mere fact that He has arranged matters so that the baptism of the dying person is possible would give some probability that the latter has the requisite internal dispositions (*Institutiones theologiae moralis* [Brussels, 1927], II, n. 150). Vermeersch argues that in a Christian land the very fact that one has heard of Christianity creates some probability that he wishes to accept it, and that even in a pagan land there is reason to believe that the dying person had enough knowledge of God to beget the general will to be saved (*Theologia moralis* [Brussels, 1927], III, n. 243). This same practise of baptizing any unknown individual in danger of death when he can give no sign of willingness to receive the sacrament is also upheld by Cappello (*De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n. 159), Iorio (*Theologia moralis* [Naples, 1939], III, n. 71), and Davis (*Moral and Pastoral Theology* [New York, 1938], III, 55).

To the arguments adduced for this theory another might be given, applicable to conditions in our land—an argument from the law of chance. In the United States a considerable number of people certainly have a sufficient intention to justify their being baptized, at least conditionally, when in danger of death. There are many Protestants who accept at least the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and who either have never been baptized or whose baptism can be regarded as doubtfully valid. There is even a considerable number of non-Christians, particularly Jews, whose belief in God and general desire of using the means of salvation would also entitle them to a conditional reception of the sacrament when they are unconscious and apparently dying. It could be safely stated that about one in every three or four persons is included in these categories; and that might seem to make it sufficiently probable, by the law of chance, that any particular individual is one of those desiring Baptism in the circumstances visualized.

However, theologians equally authoritative as those just cited hold that Baptism must be denied in the case we are considering—e.g. Merkelbach (*Summa theologiae* [Paris, 1940], III, n. 93), Prümmer (*Manuale theologiae moralis* [Fribourg, 1936], III, n. 135), Noldin-Schmitt (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Innsbruck, 1940], III, no. 73). It is to be noted, however, that these theologians seem to have in mind primarily one who is known to be a non-Christian, so that their case is not precisely the one we are considering, where nothing is known of the dying individual. The argument from the law of chance, applicable to a land like our own, does not seem to be considered.

The opinion that Baptism may not be given to the unknown individual in question seems to be more in conformity with the Code. For, it must be noted that the law demands some *probable manifestation* of the intention to receive Baptism—not merely the *probability* that the person wishes this sacrament. In view of this legislation, it is difficult to see how a priest is justified by intrinsic reasons in giving Baptism indiscriminately to persons entirely unknown. Furthermore, confirmation is given to this stricter view by decisions of the Holy Office which seem to indicate that Baptism should not be given unless there is some sign from the individual himself that he desires this sacrament (cf. Cappello, *op. cit.*, nn. 156-58).

If a priest deems the authority of the theologians cited for the more lenient view a sufficient argument to justify the use of this view, he can act with a safe conscience. Indeed, a priest who thinks this procedure lawful could also give conditional absolution and Extreme Unction to the dying person.

It must, of course, be understood that we are abstracting from cases in which the conferring of the sacraments on an unknown person would cause scandal or would lead the Catholic religion into disrepute. On this account, even for a priest who holds the more lenient view, it might be advisable to give doctors and nurses a more restricted norm in regard to baptizing dying persons—namely, that the sacrament should be given only when the dying person has at least probably manifested some definite wish. For, a nurse or a doctor who would indiscriminately apply the more lenient view might easily acquire and give to others the impression that Baptism is a kind of infallible charm, which will surely bring anyone to salvation, whatever his personal dispositions.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE LANGUAGE FOR THE INTERROGATIONS AT WEDDINGS

Question: Is it not more correct at the marriage ceremony to put the questions first in Latin and then in English, or the vernacular? Such is the proper proceeding at Baptism, so it would seem to be the one to be followed at weddings.

Answer: The response to the above question is provided by the Ritual itself. In the case of Baptism (*Supplementum ritualis Romani ad usum cleri Americae Septentrionalis Foederati,* New York, 1944), the priest is directed to ask the questions first in Latin and then in English. It is true that in the body of the Ritual (Tit. II, Cap. ii) provision is made only for interrogations in Latin. Practical considerations have dictated the direction for the use of both Latin and English in the form given in the Supplement. When, however, the rite for the ceremony of marriage is given in the Ritual (Tit. VII, Cap. ii), the priest is instructed to ask the questions of the spouses only in the vernacular (*vulgari sermone*). The

Latin forms also are given in the Ritual but evidently not for use in conjunction with the English equivalents.

In official interpretation of the rubric governing the language of the interrogations of the sponsors at Baptism, the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Mar. 5, 1904) decreed that they may be repeated in the vernacular, provided they have been said first in Latin by the officiating priest. The explicit character of the rubric of the Ritual directing that the interrogations directed to the *sponsi* at the wedding ceremony be made *vulgari sermone* dismisses any argument for putting the questions first in Latin and then repeating them in English, or other vernacular.

THE LAST GOSPEL IN ORIENTAL RITES

Question: Is there a Last Gospel as the concluding part of the Liturgy in any Oriental rite?

Answer: The Last Gospel is a specialty of the Roman Liturgy and in the one instance in which it is found in an Oriental rite its presence there is an evidence of a Romanizing influence. The unique exception to the absence of a Last Gospel in Oriental Liturgies is the Mass of the Armenians, both Catholic and Dissident or Gregorian. In that Liturgy, towards the conclusion, the celebrant, not the deacon, turns to the people and sings or reads the beginning of St. John's Gospel, i.e., the first eighteen verses of the first chapter, as with us.

This is one of several Roman elements found in the Armenian Liturgy as the result of the influence of Latin Catholic missionaries, especially during the period of the Crusades. Among other Roman features may be mentioned the practice of making the sign of the cross from left to right, as with us, instead of from right to left, as with adherents of the Eastern rites generally; the use of unleavened, in place of leavened, bread; and the position of the *Credo*, which corresponds with the place which it occupies in our Mass, instead of later on as with the Greeks, by which name we mean all followers of the rite of Constantinople, whether Greek is their liturgical language or not.

In this connection, it may be remarked that the Last Gospel is one of the latest additions to the Roman Mass. It became of obligation only in 1570 with the publication of the Missal of Pope St. Pius V.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

ANALECTA

The tenth number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for 1944 contains three constitutions of our Holy Father, two letters written by him, and his allocution to the auditors and officials of the Sacred Roman Rota. In it are found also a decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation (July 2, 1944) authorizing the Apostolic Nuncio to Brazil to give portions of the Diocese of Salto to the Dioceses of Catamarca and Jujuy respectively.[1] A decree of June 4, 1944, of the Sacred Congregation of Rites is also published in this number, recording the decision of our Holy Father that it had been sufficiently established that the Venerable Servant of God Placid Riccardi, priest and monk of the Order of St. Benedict of the Cassinese Congregation was marked by the exercise of the theological and cardinal virtues in a heroic degree.[2]

One of the papal constitutions (March 9, 1944) elevates the Prefecture Apostolic of Yütze in China to the status of a Vicariate Apostolic;[3] while the other two (March 10, 1944) elevate the missions *sui iuris* of North[4] and Central[5] Norway to the status of Prefectures Apostolic.

One of the papal letters, addressed on Oct. 24, 1944, to His Eminence Francesco Cardinal Marchetti Selvaggiani, Vicar of Rome, provides for a public course of missions in the Eternal City as a penitential offering to divine justice and a supplication that the days of war may be abbreviated.[6]

The other letter is one of congratulation addressed on Sept. 14, 1944, to His Eminence Carlo Cardinal Salotti, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, on the fiftieth anniversary of the latter's priesthood. Laudatory reference is made to his achievements in behalf of the underprivileged, especially in his Diocese of Palestrina, to which he was appointed by the reigning Pontiff. His professorial days are remembered also, as well as his career in the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The Apostolic Blessing is given to him and the clergy and the faithful of his diocese, as well as a plenary indulgence to be gained by all present at the ceremonies marking the public observance of the jubilee.[7]

[1] *AAS*, XXXVI (1944), 291.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 292.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 273.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 275.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 276.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 279.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

The allocution reported in this number is that which was pronounced by our Holy Father on October 2, 1944, at the opening of the juridical year.[8] The burden of the discourse was the fact that matrimonial court procedure is oriented to the salvation of souls, the purpose of the Church itself, to which it is subordinate. This purpose unifies the efforts of all who co-operate in the conduct of the suit, who are therefore controlled by a juridico-moral obligation of observing the provisions aimed at producing that necessary co-operation and at the attainment of the end. Precisely in matrimonial cases, this purpose is the determination of factual truth and an application to it of the law and of the will of God. Thus the Promoter of the Faith and the Defender of the Bond are not ranged against each other as if they had to defend their positions at all costs; but rather they mutually aid each other in the determination of fact. So it is with advocates and with the parties themselves. Advocates are not to create facts with eloquence and dialectic, but to serve objective truth. They are not champions seeking to be crowned with victory, but servants to aid their clients in the exposition of objective fact. Breadth of vision, however, rather than a narrow formalism, a realization that laws are for men and not men for the laws, is essential to the proper attainment of the end of the procedure, the salvation of souls. This purpose distinguishes ecclesiastical procedure from that of the state, the trials of which serve only the temporal welfare of the community. For this reason it is erroneous to hold that the ideal of ecclesiastical procedure is to approximate more and more that of the state.

The Sacred Roman Rota is congratulated for its fidelity to the norms which our Holy Father had emphasized, and in this respect it is a model for all diocesan tribunals. Our Holy Father expresses the hope that the inauguration of the juridical year with the invocation of the Holy Ghost will be an augury of the inauguration of a new juridical year of peace and justice throughout the world. He invokes on the members of the Rota and upon their labors the light of Divine Wisdom and bestows on them all and single the Apostolic Blessing.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

Book Reviews

A PREFACE TO NEWMAN'S THEOLOGY. By Rev. Edmond Darvil Benard, M.A., S.T.D. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1945. Pp. xv + 234. $2.25.

The theology of John Henry Cardinal Newman has always been as provocative to the scholar as his life has been to the biographer. And, somewhat like his life, his theology, too, develops gradually to a tortuous and delicate decision, from which point on it unfolds to the student of theology that latent content with which it had, for so long, been potentially charged. Only a devotee of his life and works can appreciate the parallel.

Dr. Benard is evidently both. For only a confirmed disciple of the convert of Littlemore could rise so well-armed to such a classic defense of the most misinterpreted theologian of our times. *A Preface to Newman's Theology* takes its place among the indispensable texts in Newmanology. To the lover of Newman it is at once a vindication and a delight, to the corrupter of Newman's thought a merciless refutation, to the novice an irresistible invitation.

The author—who has, apparently, become so imbued with his subject that his prose occasionally becomes enchantingly Newmanesque, and his adept mastery of the tools of rhetoric hauntingly reminiscent of Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*—has forged in his *Preface* not only the principles whereon the Cardinal's theological thought is to be (forever, I think) judged, but likewise the instrument which renders, for once and for all, the Modernists' claims as serviceable as so many sieves.

Wilfrid Ward, in his biography of Cardinal Newman, reveals a letter written by the convert-seminarian in Rome to Fr. Dalgairns, in which Newman so far removes himself from the tandem of Tyrrell and Loisy as to make one wonder, really, wherein either of these two modern heresiarchs dared to claim Newman as his champion. Newman wrote: "What I say is, 'I am not maintaining what I say is all true, but I wish to *assist in investigating* and bringing to light *great* principles necessary for the day—and the only way to bring these out is *freely* to investigate, with the inward habitual intention (which I trust I have) always to be submitting what I say to the judgment of the Church' " (I, 173).

Dr. Benard, however, does not essay this easy approach to a defense of Newman, but rather handles his task with a minimum of reference to Newman's subjective intent, and a consistently direct appeal to his written word, which he prefers to take on its objective face-value.

Some critics of Newman's *Essay on Development* might convert Dr. Benard's summation of Newman's "theory of assimilation" into a dialectic battleground, as indeed it could easily become. Orestes Brownson, in 1846, labelled Newman's *Essay* as "essentially anti-Catholic and Protestant," charging that Newman's treatment of Christianity as an *idea*, even though he asserted the objectivity of the revelation of which the idea was formed, was repugnant to its divinity. Newman's analogy, for example, between the development of ideas and the growth of physical life by the absorption of external materials was characterized by Brownson as "fatal to the sufficiency of the original revelation, by necessarily implying that the developed idea contains what was not in the idea as originally given." Dr. Benard finds the springboard of his defense of Newman's "assimilation theory" in the *Essay* itself. "That an idea more readily coalesces with these ideas rather than with those," Newman wrote, "does not mean that it has been unduly influenced, that is, corrupted by them, but that it has an antecedent affinity to them," which is the author's cue for his unusual synthesis which deserves reprinting in this review:

> To put it briefly, Newman's theory of "assimilation" as applied to doctrine seems to us to mean simply that the Church, in its legitimate development, could recognize with its divinely guided wisdom certain vestiges of the *primitive revelation* existing in a corrupt form in the pagan religions, and that this recognition might suggest the true explicit form of some doctrine already implicitly existing in the Christian revelation independently.
>
> With regard to the note of "power of assimilation," then, even if it is not an explanation for which we have any great affection, and even if we are inclined to think that Newman made too many factual concessions, when we examine the section from the viewpoint of the first two principles of interpretation outlined in this study we find that Newman is not guilty of an unfortunate and unorthodox adoption of the eclectic theory. We must realize that the concessions made by a controversialist for the sake of argument do not necessarily reflect his personal opinions, and we must recognize the "assimilation" passages for what they were meant to be, an *argumentum ad hominem* against those who held that the Church had formulated her body of doctrine merely by selecting various beliefs from the pagan religions. And . . . we must not forget that Newman, in spite of his use of such words as "additions" and "assimilations," considered possible only one form of development in doctrine—from implicit to explicit—which is admitted by the traditional interpretations of dogmatic progress (pp. 102 f.).

In all fairness to Brownson (and to Newman), it is satisfying to note that the American later admitted that his attack was based on a misconception of what Newman really held.

While Dr. Benard's chapter on Newman and Modernism merits publication *in toto* in any magazine devoted to theological studies, future

students of Newman (the centenary of whose conversion we commemorate this year) will find themselves chiefly indebted to the author for two major contributions in this book; first, his insistence on the four rhetorical principles without which any approach to the true meaning of Newman's theology would be rendered both opaque and perilous, and second, his extensive and corrected bibliography of Newman's works and those of his commentators.

At the risk of ruffling the cultured *decor* of these pages with a dash of modern slang, I believe that *A Preface to Newman's Theology* is a "must" for all those in whose hearts the great Cardinal finds appreciative haven, those, in other words, who subscribe to the spirit at least, if not indeed to the letter of Bede Jarrett's appraisal: "Newman now indeed seems to be of that band and of that stature [i.e. Aquinas and St. Jerome]. The Fathers of the Church were the companions of his musings until he became one with them in fellowship."

MICHAEL OWEN DRISCOLL

NO SHADOW OF TURNING. By Katherine Burton. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1944. Pp. 243. $2.50.

Herself a convert, Katherine Burton has devoted much of her literary career to writing novelized biographies of outstanding American converts. *No Shadow of Turning* is an account of the life of James Kent Stone, known as Father Fidelis of the Cross, one of the glories of the Congregation of the Passion.

Even a mere mention of some of the highlights of the life of Fr. Fidelis suffices to show that his was a most picturesque and interesting career. James Kent Stone was the grandson of Chancellor Stone of New York and the son of John Seely Stone, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Brookline, Mass. His early years recall memories of a very happy family life, education at Dr. Dixwell's Latin School in Boston, Harvard University, and Göttingen, Germany, and continental travelling where his passion for mountain climbing was but an indication of the whole spirit of his life "Altior et Excelsior."

Teaching was his ambition and after starting at Dr. Dixwell's, he became, at the age of twenty-seven, president of Kenyon College in Gambier, Ohio, and later president of Hobart College in Geneva, New York. In the meantime he had married Miss Cornelia Fay of Brookline. His life with Cornelia and his three daughters was an echo of the same happy home life in which he grew up.

Then came the crisis. Cornelia died, leaving him the care of three small children. The same year he resigned the presidency of Hobart. He sought solitude in Madison, New Jersey, the site of his grandfather's estate. He wanted to be alone with God to settle religious doubts and

face his own conscience squarely and honestly. The result was his reception into the Catholic Church on December 8, 1869, an event which startled the Protestant Episcopal Church of which he had been a minister.

Having the care of the children he could not then carry out his desire of joining a monastic order. The girls were placed in charge of the Sisters of Mercy at Manchester, Vermont, where the three girls were baptized. Then Kent Stone became Fr. Stone of the Congregation of St. Paul. Later he consented to the adoption of his two daughters (Ethel had died of pneumonia) by a Mrs. O'Connor of California and then he joined the Passionists, becoming Fr. Fidelis of the Cross. As a Passionist he filled many and important offices, Preacher, Retreat Master, Novice Master, Provincial, and Visitor General. His travels took him to Europe to attend General Chapters of the Order, and throughout the States and South America to establish new foundations. His last work was with the Negroes in the South. After years of separation from his daughters, the father was finally united with them and spent many happy hours telling them of their mother. It was in the house of his daughters that he gave his soul back to God.

All this is told in a simple, straightforward and interesting manner. Certain scenes are described with remarkable restraint which is a tribute to the literary grace of the author, for example, the dropping into the Hudson of the box containing Cornelia's picture, marriage ring and jewelry, the surrendering of his right as a parent in the adoption of the girls by Mrs. O'Connor and the reunion with his daughters after years of separation.

This work is best characterized as a novelized biography and not a strict historical biography. It goes without saying that the historian desires proof for past events and their interpretation. However, Mrs. Burton's aim is to write in a popular style and reach a greater audience to tell them of the sanctity of outstanding personages in the Church in America. Yet even with this aim in view the author could have treated more thoroughly Fr. Fidelis' *Apologia* for his embracing of Catholicism which he called *The Invitation Heeded,* and his later work, *An Awakening and What Followed.* Also the author could have given us some insight into the policy of Fr. Fidelis as Provincial of the Passionists.

No Shadow of Turning is the life of a great and outstanding man and priest. The title admirably sums up the spirit of Fr. Fidelis. There was no shadow of turning from the voice and call of God, no matter where it led him. For Catholics in their striving after greater union with God and for those seeking the light of faith which Fr. Fidelis found and followed, his life will be an inspiration.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.